THE

QUESTION BOX

NEW EDITION

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS RECEIVED ON MISSIONS TO NON-CATHOLICS

By

REV. BERTRAND L. CONWAY

of the Paulist Fathers

PREFACE TO NEW EDITION BY CARDINAL HAYES
PREFACE TO OLD EDITION BY CARDINAL GIBBONS

2,879,000 Copies Printed

THE CINCINNATI BIBLE SEMINARY
LIBRARY

New York
THE PAULIST PRESS
401 West 59th Street

282
C769

Permissu Superiorum:

JOHN B HARNEY C.S.P.,
Superior General

Nihil Obstat:

ARTHUR J. SCANLAN, S.T.D.,
Censor Librorum

Imprimatur:

✠PATRICK CARDINAL HAYES,
Archbishop, New York

New York, October 4, 1929.

5955

THE CINCINNATI BIBLE SEMINARY
LIBRARY

Set up, electrotyped, printed and copyrighted February, 1903.
Revised, rewritten, reset, electrotyped, printed and
recopyrighted, October, 1929.

Copyright, 1929, by "The Missionary Society of St. Paul the Apostle
in the State of New York."

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

THE spirit of inquiry into the history, teaching and discipline of the Catholic Church has been markedly quickened as a result of the recent wave of religious prejudice which swept over the land.

The American people as a nation, recognizing this existence of deep seated prejudice, is bound to be stirred by the naturally fair-minded and understanding attitude of the Founders of the Republic towards religion in general. The last thing in the world that America willingly and knowingly would be disposed to countenance is ignorance of the truth. The quest of the truth with regard to the Catholic Church, that historic venerable institution, identified with Christian civilization from the beginning, imposes an obligation of paramount moment, if our country is to be true to the highest and noblest in the education of our people.

In view of this, nothing could be more timely and of practical service than this newly revised, enlarged edition of THE QUESTION BOX.

A quarter of a century has elapsed since it made its first appearance. Who can measure the results of its notable apostolate,—the ignorance dispelled, the prejudice softened and often entirely eradicated, the inquiry started that brought illumination of mind and even the grace of faith, vouchsafed to countless readers, by means of this simple, direct and frank method of question and answer!

The present volume contains about one thousand questions which have been selected out of a total of 250,000 received during a period of some thirty years from all parts of the United States.

It will be very satisfying to many to find a splendid bibliography, which will stimulate further study and assure verification of the facts herein presented.

May God's blessing continue upon the mission of THE QUESTION BOX. May it bring the light of truth to the mind of Catholic and non-Catholic reader. May it move the seeker after truth to pray with the Psalmist, "Direct me in Thy truth, and teach me" (Psalm xxiv. 5).

✠ Patrick Card. Hayes

Archbishop of New York

FEAST OF
ST. TERESA OF AVILA, 1929.

AUTHOR'S FOREWORD

THE Question Box, the most striking feature of the Paulist lecture courses to non-Catholics, originated in 1893, at the World's Fair in Chicago. Archbishop John J. Keane, then rector of the Catholic University of Washington, Father Walter Elliott of the Paulist Fathers, and Father John Driscoll of the Albany diocese, took advantage of the gathering together of the nations in a Parliament of Religions to set forth the claims of the Catholic Church.

A Question Box was placed in the Assembly Hall and hundreds of queries on every phase of Catholic belief and practice were submitted daily by men and women of every religion and creed. Father Elliott at once grasped the importance of this impersonal method of controversy, and adopted it in the diocesan lecture courses to non-Catholics, which he was then about to inaugurate in the diocese of Detroit. Since that time the Question Box has been used to great advantage by missionaries in the United States and Canada, and has been utilized by many pastors in their parochial ministry—in parish schools, sodality meetings and in Sunday night services.

The Question Box has the interest of novelty, the brevity of the newspaper paragraph, and the quick change from topic to topic. It answers directly the intellectual and moral difficulties of inquirers, widens their field of study, and brings them in personal contact with a priest.

The Question Box method has the sanction of Our Lord Himself, Who answered question after question of His friends and enemies. "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife" (Matt. xix. 3)? "What good shall I do that I may have life everlasting" (Matt. xix. 16)? "Which is the

great commandment in the Law" (Matt. xxii. 36)? "By what authority dost Thou these things" (Mark xi. 28)? "Art Thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed God" (Mark xiv. 61)? "When shall the kingdom of God come" (Luke xvii. 20)? "How dost Thou, being a Jew, ask of me to drink, who am a Samaritan woman" (John iv. 9)? "How can a man be born when he is old" (John iii. 4)? "What shall we do that we may work the works of God" (John vi. 29)? "Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar" (Luke xx. 22)

The first edition of THE QUESTION BOX was published April 6, 1903—forty-five years to the day of the founding of the Paulist Fathers—its thousand questions having been received during my lecture courses to non-Catholics in thirty-six cities. Its compilation was suggested by Father Alexander Doyle, the Editor of *The Catholic World,* and by Father John Hughes, the well-beloved Superior General of the Paulist Fathers. Its circulation of over 2,300,000 copies proved that it met with a popular appeal.

This present volume has been entirely rewritten, and scores of new questions added. It contains about 1,000 questions, selected out of a total of 250,000 received the past thirty-one years on 432 missions (one week to six weeks each) in 197 cities of 64 dioceses of the United States and Canada—a missionary campaign that by God's grace netted over 6,200 converts. The inquirer will be helped in his further study of the Church Catholic by an up-to-date bibliography of over 1,500 books and articles in current reviews and encyclopedias.

Most of the books cited in the text may be obtained at the Loan Library of the Catholic Unity League, 415 West 59th Street, New York 19, N. Y., which I founded in 1917 to keep in touch with non-Catholic seekers after the truth. Catholics also are urged to use this Library, so as to become better apologists for the Faith.

At the nominal cost of one dollar a year, a member may borrow two or three books for two weeks, paying the

postage when he returns them. Thirteen thousand volumes were sent out the past year.

We have at present over 10,000 members in 500 cities of the United States and Canada. If you are not a member, I ask you to join us in this apostolate of conversion, which enjoys the blessing and approval of our Holy Father, Pope Pius XI, and of His Eminence, Patrick Cardinal Hayes of New York, our Honorary President.

We pray that the new QUESTION BOX, like its predecessor, may by God's grace win many a soul to the One Fold of the One Shepherd.

Bertrand L. Conway C.S.P.

FEAST OF THE
NATIVITY OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN, 1929.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

THE Apostolate to the non-Catholics of our country, so dear to the heart of Father Hecker, has proved itself a movement blessed by God in the thousands of converts it has won to the true Church. Within the past ten years it has been successfully inaugurated by the regular and secular clergy in over sixty dioceses of the United States, and its future is assured because of the special commendation of Pope Leo XIII and the American Hierarchy.

Although no man can blind himself to the fact that we are living in a period of widespread indifferentism and unbelief, still the hearty welcome given to the Paulist Fathers everywhere in their missions to non-Catholics goes to evidence the intense longing of thousands of earnest souls for the truth of God. The many outside the fold are like travelers lost in a forest at night, perplexed, worried, anxious, on the alert for a divine guide to lead them out of the labyrinth of this doubting. What better field for the Church than in this our beloved country, where the multitudes require but the kindly presentation of the Church's claims, and the heartful prayers of the Catholic people, to answer God's call to believe?

The Question Box is the most interesting feature of these missions to non-Catholics. At the door of the church a box is placed, and into it non-Catholics are cordially invited to deposit their difficulties and objections. These are answered the following evening. In this way the lecturer learns the mental troubles of his particular audience, and his fair, kindly answering interests the most listless and disarms the most prejudiced. The Agnostic finds his doubts vanish; the Protestant his prejudices disappear; and the Catholic his faith strengthened. Frequently the unlearning of one lie, or the answering of one difficulty, removes the veil that hid the beauty of the Church from some good soul, and he becomes "obedient to the heavenly vision."

This book answers in a brief and popular manner the most important questions actually received by the author during the past five years of missionary activity in all parts of the United States from Boston to Denver. Its object is to interest fair-minded inquirers in the further study of the Church's claims, by removing many of their false notions regarding her. We hope that many of the clean of heart approaching this study in the humble, docile spirit of the child, and asking not "How can these things be?" but simply "Has God revealed these truths?" will find their prayer for light answered by the Holy Spirit of Truth. May He guide them back to the fold of the one True Shepherd!

Faithfully yours in Christ,

✠JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS,
Archbishop of Baltimore.

FEAST OF THE CONVERSION OF ST. PAUL,
BALTIMORE, 1903.

To

A Loyal and True Friend

Very Reverend John B. Harney, C.S.P.

Superior General of the Paulist Fathers

THIS VOLUME IS AFFECTIONATELY

DEDICATED

The Question Box

THE EXISTENCE AND NATURE OF GOD

Can you prove the existence of God from reason alone? If so, why do so many people persist in denying it? Why do Catholics believe in a Personal God? Do you not fashion God after your own image? Is not your idea of God a mere abstraction? Is not God identical with the universe?

The Catholic idea of the essence and knowability of God is thus set forth by the Vatican Council: "The Catholic Church believes that there is one true and living God, the Creator and Lord of heaven and earth, Almighty, Eternal, Immense, Incomprehensible, Infinite in intellect and will and in all perfection; who, being One, Individual, altogether simple and unchangeable Substance, must be asserted to be really and essentially distinct from the world, most happy in Himself, and ineffably exalted above everything that exists or can be conceived." Holy Mother Church does hold and teach that God, the Beginning and End of all things, can certainly be known from created things by the natural light of reason; "for the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made" (Rom. xi. 20).

Our idea of God is acquired spontaneously at the very dawn of reason. Our certainty of His existence is not necessarily the result of scientific reasoning. But the mind of man, as we are assured by Wisdom (xiii.) and by St. Paul (Rom. i.), naturally rises from nature to nature's Origin and Source; from things caused and contingent to a First Necessary Cause, on which all things depend. The universe points clearly to a One, True and Living God, from whom all existence comes, and without whom life and all its development would be impossible.

Man feels instinctively that he is dependent and limited in his thought and activity; he feels within himself needs and necessities which call imperatively for complete satisfaction. Only a Supreme Being, All-Powerful and All-Loving, can satisfy the aspirations and longings of his inmost soul.

The many proofs that Christian thinkers offer for the existence of God merely deepen and confirm the solid conviction of His Personality already abiding in our hearts. They are cumulative in force, and must be studied as a whole, if we are to realize perfectly their full value. They reveal God to us as

the First Cause, the Necessary Being, the Prime Mover, the One and Perfect Being, the Designer and Orderer of the universe, the Origin of Life, the Supreme Lawgiver, and the Ultimate Good. Space forbids our developing these proofs in detail; they may be studied in the pages of any manual of natural theology (Boedder, *Natural Theology;* Joyce, *The Principles of Natural Theology*).

I think it good, however, to outline in the briefest manner possible the two arguments which, to my mind, make the most persuasive appeal to the man in the street—the argument from design and the argument from conscience.

The argument from design may be thus stated. The adaptation of means to ends is an evident proof of an intelligent cause. It is clear that nature affords us thousands of instances of such adaptation. Nature, therefore, is the result of an Intelligent Cause, God. Our minds cannot help recognizing purpose and finality in nature's operations. Mere chance, for example, cannot account for the complex arrangement of the countless parts that combine to form the retina of the human eye, or for the marvelous make-up of a bird's wing (Joyce, *The Principles of Natural Theology,* 125).

Not only is order everywhere present in nature, but beauty meets us on every side, whether in the sky, upon the earth, or in the ocean's depths. We observe it in the gorgeous coloring of the sunset and in the bright plumage of the humming bird; in the daintiness of the tiniest fern and in the massive strength of the giant redwood of the California forests; in the grace of the fleet-footed antelope and in the litheness of the tiger of the Indian jungle; in the creations of man's imagination—in the inspired lyric, in the ordered symphony, and in the world's masterpieces of painting and sculpture.

Nowhere is this purposive finality so striking as in man, who possesses characteristics in common with all the lower forms of nature, inanimate, vegetable and animal. Distinct from them, however, he lives a rational life, his intellect ever asking the why and the wherefore of things. He recognizes the laws and principles that govern his intellectual and moral judgments; he sees that they are not arbitrary and purposeless, but ordered and ruled for definite and established ends.

Do not this order and beauty, everywhere manifest in this universe of ours, point, as the needle to the pole, to the Divine Intelligence, the Divine Beauty, the Divine Designer of all things —God?

As the proof from design brings out clearly the Intelligence of God, so the proof from conscience brings out clearly His Holiness. What is conscience? It is the human mind, making a practical judgment upon the morality of our every thought, word

and deed. It commands us with decision: "This is right; do it. This is wrong; avoid it." And we feel at once an imperative call upon our obedience. Here we are dealing, not with an abstract idea, which the modern mind usually fights shy of, but with a simple, concrete fact, which everyone experiences day by day. There exists within us a strange, mysterious power which is constantly comparing all our actions with an absolute standard of right and wrong, and condemning them without appeal, when they go counter to its ordering. Conscience speaks of a necessary duty that we owe. It brings us face to face with an obligatory law, whose commands are authoritative, and whose dictates are final and unquestioned.

Law implies a lawgiver. A command always implies a superior who issues the command. Who can this Final, Absolute, Supreme Authority be, save God, the Original Source of all morality, the One Perfect Arbiter of right and wrong? Conscience is merely His voice.

Cardinal Newman puts the argument from conscience well. He writes: "Conscience always involves the recognition of a living object towards which it is directed. Inanimate things cannot stir our affections; these are correlative with persons. If, as is the case, we feel responsibility, are ashamed, are frightened, at transgressing the voice of conscience, this implies that there is One to whom we are responsible, before whom we are ashamed, whose claims upon us we fear. If, on doing wrong, we feel the same tearful, broken-hearted sorrow which overwhelms us on hurting a mother; if, in doing right, we enjoy the same sunny serenity of mind, the same soothing, satisfactory delight which follows on our receiving praise from a father, we certainly have within us the image of some Person to whom our love and veneration look, in whose smile we find our happiness, for whom we yearn, towards whom we direct our pleadings, in whose anger we are troubled and waste away. These feelings in us are such as require for their exciting cause an Intelligent Being. Thus the phenomena of conscience avail to impress the imagination with a picture of a Supreme Governor, a Judge, Holy, Just, Powerful, All-Seeing, Retributive" (*Grammar of Assent,* 109).

If you ask me why some men still persist in denying the existence of God, despite the clear testimony of reason and the general consent of all peoples from the beginning of the world, the answer is not far to seek. Just as the human will can freely and deliberately sin against the light and do the most abominable things, so the human mind can defiantly and illogically deny the most self-evident truths. The Psalmist is right in calling the atheist a "fool" (Ps. lii. 1). St. Paul is right in declaring him "inexcusable" (Rom. i. 20). Personal sin too often blinds man's

vision of the unseen world of the spirit. "The sensual man perceiveth not these things that are of the Spirit of God, for it is foolishness to him, and he cannot understand, because it is spiritually examined" (1 Cor. ii. 14).

We know to a certainty that God exists, and we know positively what He is—but only in a very dim and inadequate way (1 Cor. xiii. 12). The agnostic is most illogical when he admits the existence of a First Cause behind created things, and then dismisses God as utterly unknowable, merely because he cannot picture the Infinite and the Self-Existent in his imagination. We do know God in and through His works, and this is a true knowledge, however inadequate. The limited mind of man cannot hope to comprehend the Infinite God. He would cease to be God if he could. The Sacred Scriptures on page after page tell us of the utter incomprehensibility of God (Wisd. ix. 13, 16; Rom. xi. 33, 34).

Catholics believe that God is the One Being, of whom we can say that He is and must be. God does not happen to exist like all things created; God *IS* necessarily and essentially. God gave His name to Moses in the burning bush as the "I AM WHO AM," that is, I am the One Being that really is. In no more perfect way can the Nature of God be brought home to the human mind.

Many modern unbelievers confuse "being" viewed as a universal term, with "Being," which we refer to God. The former word has the least content of any idea the human mind can form. It signifies merely that which is capable of existence. The latter word in reference to God implies the Fullness of All Reality, and the Infinite Unity of All Perfections. This is the Catholic answer to the charge that we make God a mere abstraction.

It is also asserted that the Catholic idea of God makes Him a mere magnified man. When we and the Bible speak of God as seeing or hearing, or being pleased with the just man and angry with the sinner, everyone who thinks at all must recognize that we are speaking metaphorically. We do not worship a man made to our image and likeness—a god like the finite god of Mr. Wells, the English novelist.

But you tell me: "All the terms you apply to God are drawn from the finite and limited things you know and experience. You must need then fashion God after your own image." Not at all. When we attribute to God the perfections we find in creatures, we do not ascribe them to Him in an identical sense. If we did, God would indeed be nothing but a magnified man. On the contrary, we attribute the pure perfections of creatures,—such as goodness, truth and beauty—to God only by analogy. A comparison will illustrate our meaning. We may, for instance, compare the portrait of the President of the United States with

the living man himself, saying of both portrait and person, in different senses: "This is Herbert Hoover." In like manner, we assert in totally different senses: "Man is good; God is good." More accurately, perhaps, we should say, God is Goodness; God is Truth; for He possesses these perfections in the most eminent degree. This analogical proportion of existence between creatures and God is the very essence of the knowability of God. It is the only possible way in which the Infinite can be accurately studied and known.

We must not forget that in God all His attributes are identical with His Divine Essence; that every one of them, as we conceive them, implies all the others. Truth, Wisdom, Justice, Omnipotence, Omnipresence, is the Divine Nature of God, viewed —because of our limited faculty of knowledge—under a special aspect. We are forced from the very make-up of our minds to consider separately and piecemeal what in God is Infinite Unity of Essence.

The God we worship, therefore, is not an abstraction, nor a magnified man. He is a Personal God, the Creator and Conserver of all that exists, Eternal and Unchangeable in His Almighty Intelligence and Will, Just, Merciful, Holy.

It is certainly a most comforting and consoling thought that God, supremely happy in Himself, lovingly created the heavens and earth for His own honor and glory and for our eternal well-being. The fact of creation makes religion possible. I am not my own but God's, for He keeps me from the abyss of nothingness by the exercise of His perpetual, all-abiding care.

Creation emphasizes the complete distinction between God and the matter and force of the universe. He is not a part of things. He is in no way identified with things. His relation to them is not a sum in addition, as we might add the number of soldiers in a regiment, or enumerate the specimens in a botanical museum. God is the Absolute and Transcendent Being, utterly over and above all possible modes of the finite creation, but at the same time Immanent in the universe which He has made out of its original nothingness. "In Him we live and move and are" (Acts xvii. 28). His Presence, His Power, His Activity are at all times and in all places necessary, not only to sustain finite things in being, but also to make their every activity possible. A Creator who is not at the same time a Conserver is unthinkable.

Creation tells us of a Divine Person, who loves us with an infinite love and craves for our love. The First Cause must be a Personal God, for an impersonal First Cause is self-contradictory. The highest thing on earth we know is human personality—intelligence, volition and self-consciousness. The First Cause, as the Creator of human personality, must have Intelligence, Volition and Self-Consciousness, for It could not give what It does

not possess. All finite things exist in God as in their Source, and since the Source of all things is Infinite, the divine Intelligence and Will are in God without the limitations under which they exist in creatures.

Because God is our Beginning, He must needs be our Lord with a right to command us; because He is our Beginning, He must needs be our End, the final goal of our striving. Therefore St. John rightly defines religion: "I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End" (Apoc. i. 8).

Bibliography: Belmond, *Dieu;* Boedder, *Natural Theology;* Brosnan, *God and Reason; God Infinite and Reason;* Chetwood, *God and Creation;* Clarke, *The Existence of God;* Conway, *Is There a God?;* Cuthbert (ed.), *God and the Supernatural;* Delloué, *Solution of the Great Problem;* Driscoll, *God;* Garrigou-Lagrange, *Dieu: Son Existence;* Gerard, *Agnosticism; The World and Its Maker;* Hettinger, *Natural Religion;* Joyce, *The Principles of Natural Theology;* Labauche, *God and Man;* Matthews, *Pantheism;* Miller, *God the Creator;* Piat, *De la Croyance en Dieu;* Pohle, *God and His Knowability; God the Author of Nature;* Reys, *God and His Attributes;* Sheen, *God and Intelligence; Religion Without God.* A. Q. 1881, 92, 229, 643; 1891, 462; 1897, 278.—C. B. Jan., 1897; Jan., 1898.—C. W. xxix. 212; xxxi. 39, 257; ciii. 155, 289; lv. i. —D. T. iii. 2034-2201; iv. 756-1300.—R. A. April, May, 1928.

INDEPENDENT MORALITY

Cannot a man be moral without believing in God? Is not virtue its own reward?

No, the only basis of morality is God, the Infinitely Holy and Just Lawgiver, who has written His law in the hearts of men (Rom. ii. 15), and given them the light of reason to discover the moral law that He has revealed. "Morality," writes Liddon, "severed from religious motives, is like a branch cut from a tree; it may here and there, from accidental causes, retain its greenness for a while, but its chance of vigorous life is a very slender one. Nor is it possible to popularize a real morality, a morality that shall deal with motives as well as acts, without unveiling to the eye of the soul, something more personal than an abstract law" (*Some Elements of Religion,* 18).

The unbelievers of our day have attempted in vain to frame theories of morality independent of religion. Is utility to be the basis of morality? Christianity indeed insists upon a special duty of benevolence to our fellowmen, and ever works for the general welfare, but reason affirms that the common good is not the SOLE and all-embracing end of man; he is not WHOLLY

subject to society. Utilitarianism accounts for the modern paganism which would sterilize the unfit and feeble-minded, and improve the race by the eugenics of the stud-farm. Is pleasure the moral criterion? Then you urge people to taste the forbidden fruit and judge for themselves, thus making immorality and crime a necessary condition of virtue (Cronin, *The Science of Ethics,* 275-372). Is virtue its own reward? Experience proves that virtue often walks in poverty and rags, while vice drives by in a Rolls-Royce. Is the inner sanction of conscience sufficient? It may easily be deadened by the constant rejection of righteousness, and then it calls good evil and evil good. Are legal sanctions effective? They cannot touch one's inner motives and thoughts, as Americans are discovering in the open defiance which millions of our citizens bid to our ill-advised prohibition law. Will public opinion be our guide? It is often most corrupt, and blames men for deeds of worth, while it praises the successful and wealthy scoundrel.

The only One who can read the inmost secrets of our minds and hearts; the only One who can rightly estimate our every motive, and adequately and justly punish and reward our good and evil thoughts, words and deeds is God.

Cardinal Mercier well says: "It is a vain hope to expect the moral law to be observed without recourse to the idea of God. For how is the observance of the moral law to be sufficiently guaranteed, if man has no certitude that a Just and Powerful God will sooner or later establish an eternal harmony between virtue and happiness on the one hand, and between vice and misery on the other" (*Manual of Scholastic Philosophy,* ii., 257).

Bibliography: Fox, *Religion and Morality;* Newman, *Grammar of Assent,* ch. v.; Rickaby, *Moral Philosophy;* Ward, *Witnesses to the Unseen.*

Is not religion an invention of priests or statesmen?

There is no record whatever in history of the invention of religion.

This objection puts the cart before the horse, for priests could not have existed before religion began. "It was religion, realized and felt, which called for their service" (Hettinger, *Natural Religion,* 68).

"When the rationalist," says Lotze, "attributed the rise of religion to man's natural tendency to superstition, a tendency artfully played upon by priestcraft, he thereby assumed as his primary cause an organized combination, which was itself only possible in an already advanced stage of civilization" (*Microcosmos,* iii., 54).

Bibliography: C. B. April, 1899.

Is not religion to be traced to fear, which was aroused in man by witnessing the wonders of nature?

No, the earthquake, the tidal wave and the storm may have aroused in primitive man a purely natural fear, as they do to-day among the most highly civilized, but if the human soul were not already conscious of the existence of God, how could the idea of God be evolved by the mere contemplation of the phenomena of nature? De Maistre writes: "By calling God Lord, Master, Father, man shows that his idea of God is not the result of fear. It is also noticeable that music, dancing and the other arts have always been employed in divine worship, and so inseparable is the idea of rejoicing from that of a festival, that the word 'feast' is everywhere synonymous with a religious solemnity" (*Soirées de S. Petersburg*).

Have not some travelers declared that they have come across tribes without any belief in God?

The assertion has often been made, for example, by Sir John Lubbock in his *Origin of Civilization*. It has been denied, however, by many eminent scholars, such as Tylor (*Primitive Culture*, i., 378), Hellwald (*Natural History of Man*, 95) and Peschel (*Völkerkunde*, 260).

It is always a most difficult task to discover the real beliefs of savage peoples, because they are often shy in the presence of white men, and often fearfully superstitious about mentioning the names of the gods they worship (Max Müller, *Lectures on the Science of Religion*, 53).

The men responsible for this false statement erred because of their ignorance of the peculiar idioms of the natives' language, their superficial study of the religion in question, and their mistaking a people's crude notions of the deity for absolute atheism.

A few years ago two Catholic priest scientists, by remaining a couple of years in Tierra del Fuego, disproved absolutely the alleged atheism of the natives of that country.

May a Catholic believe in evolution? Does not evolution contradict the teaching of the Bible? Can evolution be reconciled with the theistic and Christian theory of life? Has not evolution proved the animal descent of man?

As the Church has made no pronouncement upon evolution, Catholics are perfectly free to accept evolution, either as a scientific hypothesis or as a philosophical speculation. What is evolution? "As a scientific hypothesis," writes Father Wasmann, "evolution does not consider the present species of plants and of animals as forms directly created by God, but as the final

result of an evolution from other species existing in former geological periods. . . . It does not concern itself with the origin of life, but merely inquires into the genetic relations of systematic species, genera and families, and endeavors to arrange them according to natural series of descent" (*C. E.*, v., 654).

It is good to remember that evolution is not a proved fact, despite the assertions of many pseudo-scientists. It is not and cannot be an experimental science. "It is essentially a theory based upon a group of hypotheses which are in harmony with one another, and afford the most probable explanation of the origin of organic species. We cannot demand to see the evolution of species taking place before our eyes, in such a way as to give us a direct confirmation of the theory of evolution" (Wasmann, *The Problem of Evolution,* 7). As a working hypothesis it has stimulated scientific inquiry, and given us many a new fact, but it suggests more problems than it solves.

The Bible is not a textbook of science, and, therefore, cannot rightly be quoted either for or against evolution. As Pope Leo says in his Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus:* "The sacred writers did not intend to teach men these things, that is to say, the essential nature of the things of the visible universe, things in no way profitable for salvation. Hence they did not seek to penetrate the secrets of nature, but rather described and dealt with things in more or less figurative language, or in terms which were commonly used at the time, and which in many instances are in daily use to this day, even by the most eminent men of science. Ordinary speech primarily and properly describes what comes under the senses." The Biblical account of creation was written for men of every age, independently of the changing views of physical science.

Evolution is in no sense at variance with the theistic or Christian theory of life. Father von Hammerstein writes: "If the Creator did not create each single species of animal in its present form, but caused it to acquire its present appearance and instincts by means of an independent evolution, carried on through a long line of ancestry, His Wisdom and Power are manifested the more clearly. Therefore, if the theory of evolution is proved to be true within definite limits, it by no means sets aside the Creator, but, on the contrary, an All-Wise and an All-Powerful Creator becomes the more necessary and indispensable, as the First Cause of the evolution of the organic species. A simile will bring out the truth of this very clearly. A billiard player wishes to send a hundred balls in different directions. Which will require greater skill—to make a hundred strokes and send each ball separately to its goal, or, by hitting one ball, to send all the ninety-nine others in the directions which he has in view?" (*Gottesbeweise,* 150.)

Man is composed of body and soul. His soul cannot owe its origin to evolution, for it is a simple, spiritual being, essentially different from the soul of an animal. It can therefore come into existence only by way of creation. His body *may* have been evolved from an existing animal organism, but the so-called proofs from zoology and paleontology are absolutely inconclusive. Haeckel's statement in his *Riddle of the Universe* that "man's immediate descent from apes is an undoubted historical fact" has been stigmatized as false and absurd by eminent biologists (Kiel, *Haeckel's Monism and Its Supporters*, 6). While not intrinsically impossible, this theory, although never condemned by any of the Roman Congregations, seems to be contrary to the general mind of the Church.

Bibliography: Frank, *Evolution in the Light of Facts;* Gerard, *The Old Riddle and the Newest Answer;* Guibert, *Whence and How of the Universe;* LeBuffe, *Human Evolution and Science;* McWilliams, *A Catechism on Evolution;* O'Toole, *The Case Against Evolution;* Raschab, *Neo-Scholastic Philosophy;* Wasmann, *The Problem of Evolution; Modern Biology and the Theory of Evolution;* Windle, *Evolution and Catholicity; The Evolutionary Problem as it is To-day.* A. Q. 1893, 495, 762; 1894, 472.—C. B. July, 1901; Jan., 1902.—C. G. Oct., 1926.—C. W. xl. 145; cxii. 205.—M. Aug., 1926.

Is not conscience a sufficient guide for a man, even if he does not believe in God?

No, for conscience is simply the practical reason, determining what is right and wrong in human actions. It is by no means infallible, but may lead men astray in morals, as it may lead them astray in telling them how to invest their money. If you divorce morality from religion, and deny that God is the basis and sanction of the moral law, reason becomes a blind guide, subject to public opinion, caprice, passion or prejudice, and the commanding power of conscience loses its validity and force. Once you admit the existence of God—Creator, Lord and Final End—you admit a Supreme Power possessed of an absolute right to command an inferior, dependent creature, who in justice is bound to obey his Lord, and fulfill the end for which he was created.

All law supposes a superior. The modern agnostic theory that each man's reason originates the moral laws by which he is bound, is contrary to reason, revelation, and common sense. No man can be superior to himself, or regard himself as his own superior.

"When an agnostic or atheist," writes Father Sharpe, "claims possession of a conscience, and ascribes certain of his actions to the influence of a sense of duty, he recognizes the principle of causality; . . . he further recognizes a principle of stability and

consistency in the world. . . . Again he is guided in his estimate by the possession of certain ideals of perfection, such as goodness, beauty, truth, which he tries to approximate to in his own actions. But these guiding principles are the elements of the idea of God" (*Principles of Christianity*, 68).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: D. T. iii. 1155-1174.

Why is it that a good God allows the wicked to prosper in this world, while the good are afflicted with every misery?

As a matter of fact prosperity is not always the lot of the wicked, and misery always the portion of the good. Many good people enjoy health, wealth, social and political preeminence, while many wicked people suffer, even in this life, sickness, poverty, disgrace, imprisonment and death on the gallows or in the electric chair.

Happiness is not always to be measured by mere externals. The virtuous poor may be happy in the possession of the true faith, and appreciate keenly the consolations of religion, while the wicked rich often find life so empty and profitless, that they kill themselves in despair.

But even if in many instances the wicked prosper, and the good are afflicted, the fact merely proves the existence of an after life, wherein an Infinitely Just and Loving God will right all the inequalities and injustices of this world. This life is a time of trial, during which a man must prove himself worthy of the eternal happiness, that God metes out to those who serve Him. The sufferings of the good, therefore, are to be regarded as part of the punishment due their sins, and as a great opportunity of merit, while the prosperity of the wicked is to be looked upon as their reward in this life. "Woe to you that are (wicked) rich," says Christ, "for you have your consolation" (Luke vi. 24). And St. Paul says: "For I reckon that the sufferings of this time are not worthy to be compared with the glory to come" (Rom. viii. 18).

Why did God make the world? Does God really care for the creatures He has made? Can you reconcile the evil in the world with an Almighty and an All-Loving God?

Catholics believe that the world was made for the glory of God. (Vatican Council, Sess. iii., ch. i., can. i.), a dogma clear on every page of the Bible (Ps. xviii. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 24-28; Eph. i. 56; Phil. i. 11). God is not only the Creator, but the Conserver of all things. Without His sustaining hand, everything would at once lapse into its original nothingness; "in Him we

move, and live and are" (Acts xvii. 27). His Providence is all-embracing, not even a sparrow falling to the ground without Him (Matt. x. 29); it is infallible in all its workings, no secondary cause being able to thwart the divine plan. Once we believe in God's all-wise Providence, the problem of evil need not disturb us, for we know that God's ruling "reacheth from end to end mightily, and ordereth all things sweetly" (Wisd. viii. 1).

The Catholic Church does not pretend to give an adequate, but merely a partial solution to the problem of evil. "For who among men is he that can know the counsel of God? or who can think what the will of God is?" (Wisd. ix. 13.) She considers it a stupendous mystery which will be perfectly understood only in the world to come. In the name, however, of reason and of faith, she condemns absolutely the many false solutions advanced by alien philosophies and religions. She condemns the dualism of ancient Persia, which taught the existence of two equal principles, a good and a bad, combating continually against each other; the fundamental pessimism of a Schopenhauer or a Von Hartman, which declared the world too evil to be the product of a good God; the metaphysical optimism of a Leibnitz, which held that this evil-stained universe was the best of all absolutely possible worlds, and the arrogant will-to-power optimism of a Nietzsche, which denounced Christianity as a slave morality; the pagan Christian Science of Mrs. Eddy, which regarded all evil as an illusion of "mortal mind"; the inane view of Mr. Wells, whose "finite" god is supposed to lighten the burden of evil by sharing the evil he cannot altogether overcome.

The God we worship is, as the Council of the Vatican teaches, "the One, True and Living God, the Creator and Lord of heaven and earth, Almighty, Eternal, Immense, Incomprehensible, Infinite in Intelligence and Will and in all Perfection, really and essentially distinct from the world . . . God, who watcheth over and governeth by His providence all things that He hath made."

Evil is not merely the absence of good, but of *due* good, "the deficiency of some good which ought to be present," as St. Thomas says (*Summa Theol.*, Ia. IIæ., Q. xlix., art. 2, ad. 1). It is a privation, but at the same time something extremely real. Physical evils imply a defect which mars the natural integrity of a being, such as blindness or mental deficiency, or interferes with the proper development of its activity, as sickness and suffering. Moral evil, or sin, is a human thought, word or deed that goes counter to right reason and the law of God, such as murder, adultery or theft.

God, therefore, cannot be the cause of evil, for evil, being something privative, cannot be the term of a positive creative act. "Just as the sun in the heavens gives light, whilst the

shadow on the ground, the absence of light, is caused by the intervention of some obstacle, such as a tree, blocking out the rays of light; so the Infinitely Good God is the cause of nothing but goodness, the absence of goodness, wherever it occurs, being caused by the intervention of some creative object, not infrequently by the misuse of free will on the part of man" (Downey, *Divine Providence,* 62).

God certainly does not intend physical evils for their own sake, for an Infinitely Intelligent God cannot mistakenly apprehend evil as good, and an Infinitely Good God cannot delight in the misery and suffering of His creatures. He permits them only because in His divine plan they will further either the general good or man's good. "He is powerful enough and good enough," said St. Augustine, "to make good even out of evil" (*Enchiridion,* ch. 11).

The true Christian does not dream of comprehending the divine plan, but he knows "that to them that love God, all things work together unto good" (Rom. viii. 28). Is suffering evil? The saints never thought so, for we find them always desirous of suffering, and welcoming it with joy. Sickness has taught many a man his utter dependence upon God, and has opened the heart of many a sinner to the consolations of religion. The blood of martyrs has been the fruitful seed of Christians, and the death of Christ upon the Cross won the salvation of the world. Suffering too is a constant reminder that "we have not here a lasting city, but we seek one that is to come" (Heb. xiii. 14): "for that which is at present momentary and light of our tribulation, worketh for us above an eternal weight of glory" (2 Cor. iv. 17).

An Infinitely Good God necessarily loves His own goodness, and necessarily hates sin, which implies a deliberate refusal of a creature to obey his Creator and Lord. Our service is a free service; we are not automata or slaves. The freedom of the will that we possess necessarily involves the possibility of sin. "Creatures by their very existence involve evil, as shadows are involved by the existence of objects that intercept the sunlight. Therefore, even an Omnipotent God could not exclude evil from creation. Otherwise creation would itself be the Creator" (E. I. Watkin, *God and the Supernatural,* 161).

Will you insist that many men have no fair moral chance, because their bad stock, weak temperament, or evil environment seems to make their wickedness inevitable? This is simply untrue. God takes into account every possible factor that might palliate a man's guilt, and He gives to all sufficient grace to conquer sin in every temptation. No man is ever forced to sin. He must account at the judgment only for his free, deliberate evil deeds.

The dogma of Original Sin throws a white light upon the problem of evil. For by it Adam "lost for himself and for us the sanctity and justice received from God, and, defiled by the sin of disobedience, transmitted to all mankind death, the sufferings of the body, and sin, the death of the soul" (Council of Trent, Sess. v., can. 2; *Cf.* Gen. iii. 16-29; iii. 7; Rom. v. 12-19). But as the Apostle says: "Where sin abounded, grace did more abound" (Rom. v. 20). Our Lord's death on the Cross freed us from the slavery of sin, and restored us to the supernatural order, but the preternatural gifts of Adam, which freed him from the dread of suffering and death, from ignorance and concupiscence, were forever lost. To Adam's representative sin, therefore, we may trace many present day evils. Moreover our Savior made our ignorance, our concupiscence and our sufferings the occasion of supernatural satisfaction and merit. The supreme value of our spiritual struggle for heaven is, as Father Rickaby has pointed out (*In An Indian Abbey*, 245), the real purpose of God's permission of evil. In the solidarity of Christ's Mystical Body, in union with Christ's infinite merits, we may, by the grace of God, make light of the trials and sufferings of this life, and conquer, as Christ did, the power of Satan and his hosts of evil.

Bibliography: D'Arcy, *The Problem of Evil;* Boedder, *Natural Theology;* Downey, *Divine Providence;* Marsh, *The Problem of Evil;* Rickaby, *The Problem of Evil; Moral Philosophy; In An Indian Abbey;* Sharpe, *The Principles of Christianity;* Smith, *The Problem of Evil.* A. Q. 1887, 140.—I. T. April, 1914.—C. G. March, 1927.

Did not the Catholic Church once teach that woman had no soul?

The Catholic Church never taught so absurd a doctrine. This strange calumny arose from a stupid or a malicious perversion of a passage in St. Gregory of Tours, *History of the Franks,* viii., 20.

One of the bishops attending the Council of Macon, France, in 585, asserted in a meeting outside the regular conciliar sessions, that the word *HOMO* could not be used to designate a woman, but must be used exclusively to designate a man. His fellow bishops told him he was mistaken, and they quoted the Sacred Scriptures (Gen. v. 2) in proof. They might also have quoted Cicero, Ovid, Juvenal and Pliny, as well as a number of medieval Latinists to the same effect.

The question discussed was a grammatical, not a dogmatic question.

Bibliography: D. A. i. 1897.—M. Jan., 1911.

THE HUMAN SOUL

What is the human soul? When is the soul created? Is not the mind composed of a series of successive states? Have animals souls?

The soul is the ultimate principle of our individual conscious life, the principle by which we feel, think and will. It is a substantial principle, subsisting in itself, and thus distinct from an accident, *v. g.*, color, which is a mode or attribute of something else. The soul is a simple substance, *i. e.*, it is not composed of separate parts; it is also a spiritual substance, *i. e.*, its existence is independent of matter.

The character of the soul is known by its acts. That I am a substantial self is a fact of immediate experience. Father Maher says: "That I am a real being, subsisting in myself; that I am immediately aware of myself as the subject of sensations, feelings and thoughts, but not one of them or all of them; that I am the cause of my own volitions; that I am distinct from other beings; that there is in me a self—that I am an *Ego* which is the centre and source of my acts and states, the ultimate ground and subject of my thoughts and affections, is forced upon me by constant, intimate, immediate self-experience, with the most irresistible evidence. If it be an illusion, there is no belief or cognition, however clear or certain, that can claim assent" (*Psychology,* 463).

The mind is not composed of a series of successive events or states. On the contrary it has a permanent identity, which ever remains the same during all the varying modes of consciousness. The fact of memory proves this. I am absolutely certain that the *Ego* now writing these lines is the identical *Ego* that wrote the first edition of *The Question Box* twenty-six years ago. My memory could not give me this absolute assurance of both past and present happenings, if my mind were a mere succession of events or states.

The soul is a simple, spiritual substance possessing an activity absolutely alien and opposed to the nature of extended and material things. We are capable of forming abstract and universal ideas such as Truth, Goodness and Beauty; we can perceive the rational relations between ideas, making judgments and inferences, and conducting exact processes of inductive and deductive reasoning; we are capable of self-reflection, recognizing with ease the absolute identity of ourselves thinking about something, and ourselves reflecting upon that thinking self; we are possessed of free will, capable of self-determination, and untrammeled in our pursuit of truth, justice and righteousness. The spirituality of our thought, our volition and our self-conscious-

ness is fundamentally opposed in kind to all the properties of things material and extended.

The animal soul on the contrary is intrinsically and essentially dependent on matter. The animal is incapable of forming abstract ideas, and manifests no spiritual activity whatever. It possesses neither intellect nor free will. It is ruled entirely by instinct, and its activity is entirely limited to the sensible and the concrete. The animal soul, or principle of life, is, therefore, incapable of life apart from the body, and perishes with it.

The human soul is directly created by God. God gives existence to the soul at the very moment when it is to be united to the body produced by generation, because it is designed by God to form with that body one human nature. The Council of Vienne in 1311 defined that "the rational or intellectual soul is directly and essentially the form, *i. e.*, the life-giving principle, of the body." The divine origin of the soul is a most fundamental doctrine, which gives the lie direct to the theory of atheistic evolution, and invests paternal authority with a religious and a sacred character.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Driscoll, *The Soul;* Maher, *Psychology,* 458-594: Miller, *General Psychology,* 267-290. D. A. i. 86-123.—D. I. i. 969-1041.

THE FREEDOM OF THE WILL

May not the freedom of the will be an illusion and determinism the only true philosophy? Is not your theory of motiveless volition contrary to facts? Is it not true that the strongest motive always prevails?

Free will is the capability of self-determination; it is "that property in virtue of which a rational agent, when all the conditions required to elicit a volition are present, can either put forth or abstain from that volition" (Maher, *Psychology,* 395).

Free will is not "motiveless volition." It does not imply choice *without* motive, but choice *between* motives. It is not true that we always act on the strongest motive, for many men resist, time and time again, the onslaughts of a violent temptation. The only reason we can have for calling the motive on which we act the strongest is the fact that we act upon it. The objection is either untrue, or it resolves itself into the harmless statement: The motive which prevails does prevail.

The fact of free will we know by direct consciousness, just as we know our own identity. We are aware that we can freely guide our own thoughts, selecting, if we choose, the least attrac-

tive. We are aware that, when two alternative courses of action lie before us, we can freely deliberate upon their respective merits, reflecting, inquiring, and examining the reasons for each side. We are conscious that our final choice is free: we can purchase a Buick or a Hudson car; we can invest our monies in railroad stocks or industrials; we can resist an evil thought or consent to it.

The moral consciousness of mankind points to the freedom of the will. The sense of moral obligation is written in every man's heart; it is as certain as the uniformity of nature. We know that we are bound to do right and to avoid wrong. We know also that we are absolutely free to avoid evil. Is it not unreasonable for the determinist to tell us that these solid convictions are mere illusions?

Again, we always carefully distinguish between what we do inadvertently and what we do deliberately. No man feels any remorse or compunction for an action he could not possibly avoid. It cannot be imputed to him for either praise or blame. But if having committed a deliberate crime, he afterwards condemns it as sinful and blameworthy, he does so only because he is convinced that he acted freely and without compulsion. The determinist knows nothing of remorse or blame, for as James says, "He virtually defines the universe as a place in which what *ought* to be is impossible" (*The Will to Believe*, 61).

The idea of merit supposes free will. "When I have struggled against a difficult temptation, or made some deliberate sacrifice in the cause of virtue, I feel that my act is meritorious, that I have deserved a reward. I may see no prospect throughout my life of receiving the recompense. But I am none the less assured that I have established a right to it, and that such a recompense is just. And this I judge to be so because I believe that act to be free. . . . The good accomplished unwittingly, however useful, is not meritorious on the part of the agent; praise or esteem which I may receive for it, I recognize in my heart to be undeserved" (Maher, *Psychology*, 402).

Determinism is a pessimistic philosophy, destructive of morals and religion. Making man a mere automaton and a slave of his heredity or environment, it denies the essential notions of imputability and responsibility, and scorns the free homage of mind and will which we owe our Creator and Lord.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Fonsegrive, *Essai sure le Libre Arbitre;* Gutberlet, *Die Willensfreiheit;* Maher, *Psychology;* Miller, *General Psychology;* Noël, *La Conscience du Libre Arbitre;* Piat, *La Liberté;* Rickaby, *Free Will and Four English Philosophers;* Ward, *The Philosophy of Theism.* C. W. xlix. 43.—D. Oct., 1891.

THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL

Can you prove the immortality of the soul from reason alone? Does not the soul which is born with the body perish with it? Did the Jews believe in the immortality of the soul?

That the human soul will survive after death in the possession of an endless conscious existence, is one of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. While it is true that temporal rewards and punishments from God figured largely in the Old Testament, the immortality of the soul is taught in its pages clearly and explicity (Gen. ii. 7; Wisd. ii. 22, 23; Eccles. xii. 7; Prov. xv. 24; Isa. xxv. 10; li. 6; Dan. xii. 2).

The immortality of the soul can be proved from reason. a. *Universal Belief*—"The notion of the survival of the spirit after death in some form, whether clear or vague, has ever existed in the human mind from the most primitive times to the present hour" (Henry Frank, *Modern Light on Immortality*, 35). Father Knabenbauer, in his *Das Zeugnis für die Unsterblichkeit der Seele*, gives us the testimony of the nations, who deduced their belief "both from the phenomena of their inner life, and from the phenomena of what we call the external world" (Frazer, *Belief in Immortality*, 217). Such a universal belief, influencing vitally a man's moral life, must needs be true, otherwise human reason would be utterly incapable of attaining any certain truth.

b. *The Nature of the Soul*—The very nature of the human soul proves its immortality. The fact that the mind can form abstract concepts, make intellectual judgments, draw logical inferences, and double back upon itself, proves that the soul is essentially independent of the body. It is a simple, indivisible, spiritual substance, that does not perish with the body, because it is by its very nature incorruptible. It cannot be annihilated by any human power, because creation and annihilation are correlative terms. Omnipotence alone can create and alone can annihilate. Reason tells us that God would not create an incorruptible nature merely to destroy it, and revelation confirms this postulate of reason. "And these shall go into everlasting punishment; but the just into life everlasting" (Matt. xxv. 46).

c. *The Nature of the Mind and Will*—Man's intellect can form the idea of endless duration, and transcend the boundaries of the physical universe; it is not bounded by space or time. It has a natural affinity with the eternal realities which lie beyond all sensible experience. The intellect is never content with the truth it possesses, but is ever craving for a fuller possession of knowledge. Only the infinite Truth can satisfy it in the life

to come. Man's will craves for a perfect, unending happiness, which is unattainable in this life, because evil is ever present, and the good is never lasting. Nothing finite can satisfy man's aspirations, for he was made to possess the Eternal Goodness, God. If there is no life beyond the grave, this highest longing of man's soul is utterly without meaning.

d. *The Ethical Argument*—A Just and Holy Lawgiver would not impose His moral law upon mankind, without giving it an efficacious sanction in a future life. "If there be no future life, then the fundamental principles of morality are in irredeemable conflict with the just claims of reason; the fount of seeming law, order and finality is hopeless discord and senseless strife; the most imperious affirmation of our rational moral nature is one prolonged fraud; the ethical life of man, all that is highest and greatest in this world—that which alone is truly good—is a meaningless chaos. Intrinsic contradiction, absolute irrationality is the last answer both of science and philosophy" (Maher, *Psychology*, 542).

Bibliography: Downey, *Personal Immortality;* Fell, *The Immortality of the Human Soul;* Maher, *Psychology;* Mainage, *L'Immortalité;* Moreux, *What Shall We Become After Death?;* Piat, *Destiné de l'Homme;* Sasia, *The Future Life;* Schneider, *The Other Life;* Vaughan, *Life After Death;* Vonier, *Life of the World to Come.* A. Q. 1877, 123, 347.—C. B. Jan., April, 1900.—D. July, 1893; April, 1918.

Could not man be moral and religious by obeying the dictates of his reason? What need is there of a divine revelation?

If you grant that God has created man for a supernatural destiny, you must admit that He has revealed that destiny to us, together with the means of attaining it. But a divine revelation is morally necessary to observe even the precepts of the natural law. The Church condemned Luther for teaching that, because of original sin, natural truth was beyond man's reach. Reason alone can prove the existence of God, the freedom of the will, and the immortality of the soul. But while some few may attain to a knowledge of moral and religious truth, the majority of mankind need revelation as a sure and certain guide.

The failure of unaided reason to give man an adequate knowledge of his duties towards himself, his fellowmen and God is evident, if we study the history of the pagan nations prior to the coming of Christ. Cicero tells us that nothing was too absurd for a philosopher's creed (*De Div.*, ii., 58), and he often alludes to the ignorance, uncertainty and contradictions of the teachers of his time, as well as to the immoral character of their lives (*Qu. Tusc.*, ii., 4; iii., 12). Skepticism about the gods

reigned among the cultured classes, although they defended the immoral, public worship of idolatry as a State necessity, the better to control the people (*De Rep.* 4). Widespread superstition, the usual accompaniment of unbelief, made the trade of augur and soothsayer a lucrative profession, and many truths of the primitive revelation were travestied by the current degrading myths and fables. Plato, one of the greatest of the Greeks, did not hesitate to uphold slavery, to recommend the exposure of sickly children, and to tolerate the grossest form of immorality.

"The difficulties," writes Joyce, "in the attainment of the requisite knowledge are insuperable. For men to be able to attain such a knowledge of the natural law as will enable them to order their lives rightly, the truths of that law must be so plain that the mass of men may discover them without long delay, and possess a knowledge of them which shall be alike free from uncertainty and secure from serious error. No reasonable man will maintain that in the case of the greater part of mankind this is possible. Even the most vital truths are called in question. The separation of truth from error is a work involving time and labor. For this the majority of men have neither inclination nor opportunity. Apart from the security which revelation gives they would reject an obligation both irksome and uncertain" (*C. E.*, xiii., 3).

Jesus Christ was the answer to the world's longing for a divine, infallible revelation. He taught men clearly the purpose of their existence, the nature of God, and His love for men, the divine meaning of suffering and temptation, the malice of sin and the need of atonement, the sanction of an everlasting reward and punishment. What Christ revealed His Church teaches, as His divine, infallible representative, until He come again.

Bibliography: Delloué, *Solution of the Great Problem,* 172-202; Hettinger, *Revealed Religion,* 44-69.

Is not religion a question of education and environment rather than a matter of intellectual conviction?

It is true that many men are Catholics, Protestants or unbelievers because their parents were so before them, or because of their early training. But the Catholic Church teaches that faith is an act of the intellect based on rational motives of credibility that will stand any test. Given a desire for the truth, a prayerful longing for the grace of God which is never denied those who humbly ask it, a man can readily counteract the false teachings of an irreligious environment or an anti-Catholic education. The Vatican Council thus describes faith: "Seeing that man wholly depends upon God as his Creator and Lord, and seeing that created reason is entirely subject to the Uncreated

Truth, we are bound to submit by faith our intellect and will to God the Revealer. But this faith, which is the beginning of man's salvation, the Church confesses to be a supernatural virtue, whereby, with the help of God's grace, we believe what He reveals, not because we perceive its intrinsic truth by the natural light of our reason, but on account of the authority of God, who can neither deceive nor be deceived" (Sess. iii., ch. iii.).

If one's education and environment happen to be in accord with divine truth, we are humbly grateful to God, and we do our utmost to live in accord with its teachings. But if, by the grace of God, a man comes to realize that he is an alien to the true Church, he is bound in conscience to search and inquire, until he know the truth that is of God.

Is not religion a mere question of feeling or emotion? I have been present at revival meetings, and the amount of religion present was in direct proportion to the excitement caused?

No, you must not judge Christianity from the excesses of emotional revival meetings. The Catholic Church has always protested against a religion of pure subjective feeling, which, under stress of nervous excitement, makes the emotions take the place of a rational supernatural faith.

The Catholic Church, while answering every need of the human heart, safeguards her children against all emotional and sentimental delusion, by declaring faith an intellectual act guided by an upright will, and aided always by God's grace. Conversion with her does not consist in emotional feeling, but in the acceptance of all God's truth on His word, a heartful sorrow for sins committed, with a confession thereof to the priest as the ambassador of God (2 Cor. v. 20).

The substitution of sentiment for faith was the great crime of the sixteenth century revolt.

BUDDHISM

Is it not true that the Christian gospels are based upon the older religion of Buddhism? Does not the study of comparative religions prove that Buddhism is in no way inferior to Christianity?

It is most illogical to assume that resemblances always imply dependence. The similarities often cited to prove Christianity's borrowing from Buddhism, such as the asceticism of its monks,

the celibacy of the clergy and the like, may be accounted for by the fact that men everywhere have practically the same experiences, feelings and desires. The similarities in the lives of our Lord and Gotama are to be traced to Buddhistic borrowings. For while there is no evidence whatever to prove the spread of Buddhism westward to the Greek World as early as the beginning of the Christian era, it is certain that Christianity reached India in the first two centuries.

Much of Gotama's life and actual doctrine is mere conjecture, for the Buddhist sacred books come down to us for the most part only from the year 300. They are far inferior to our Bible in spirituality, depth of thought and variety of subject.

Buddhism is far inferior to Christianity as a religion, for not recognizing man's dependence upon an Infinitely Loving God, it makes salvation rest solely on personal effort. It is utterly lacking in the strong Christian motives for right conduct, and is at best a selfish utilitarianism. Its doctrine of *Karma* with its imaginary reincarnations is an unnatural superstition, adverse to sound morality and true religion. Its utter pessimism, which declares every form of conscious existence an evil, is contrary to the instincts of human nature, and its promise of the unconscious repose of Nirvana is devoid of the hope and joy of the Christian's eternal reward of the Beatific Vision.

Bibliography: Aiken, *The Dhamma of Gotama;* Belloc, *A Companion to Wells' Outlines of History,* viii.; Burrows, *The Open Door;* Huby (ed.), *Christus,* vi.; Martindale (ed.), *The History of Religions,* i.; De la Vallée Poussin, *La Morale Buddhique; The Way to Nirvana,* A. Q. 1897, 857.—C. E. iii. 28.—D. July, 1899; April, 1890.— R. A. April 15, May 1, 1926.

What is your estimate of Theosophy?

Theosophy is a modern form of pantheism, borrowed from India, and popularized in the West since 1877 by Madame Blavatsky, Mrs. Annie Besant and Colonel Henry Olcott.

It rejects "the God of the Christians, *i. e.,* a Personal God, denies the fact of creation, and regards the universe as the manifestation of the Great Eternal Reality, or "the great rhythmic throbbing of the Unique All," whatever that may mean. The world consists of seven interpenetrating planes, and man, the Microcosm, of seven distinct parts, four physical and three spiritual. Personality consists of the physical body, the vital principle, the astral body and the animal soul; individuality of the higher human mind, the spiritual soul and the spirit. The terminology of theosophy is grotesque and fanciful, like the terminology of the Gnostics in the first ages of Christianity.

At death we lose our personality, but—strange is the theorizing of a mystic occultism—not our individuality. With infallible

precision the Mahatmas tell us of successive purifications through various incarnations, which usually take place twice in every twenty-one hundred years! The whole course of the after life and each reincarnation is determined by the Buddhistic law of *Karma,* that inexorable law of retributive justice, which allows no place for free will, hope, repentance, atonement or prayer.

As Martindale well says: "Theosophist theology 'deperson alizes' God without rendering Him more sublime, and drags Him down to matter without making Him more lovable. It exalts man's self to the divine, in spite of all his conscience tells him of his essential dependence and his sins; it preaches a spiritual series of necessary causes and effects, which makes the good and evil in him alike no concern of his, since it was not he who started the upward or downward series, however many be the intervening births" (*Theosophy,* 130).

Theosophy is a queer medley of Brahmin and Buddhist pantheism and atheism, utterly opposed to Christianity by its denial of a Personal God Creator, of probation in this life, of free will and of personal accountability of the sinner before an All Just and Merciful Judge. Its history is fictitious from start to finish, and its marvels are to be ascribed to fraud, illusion and diabolism.

Bibliography: Hull, *Theosophy and Christianity;* Mainage, *The Principles of Theosophy;* Martindale, *Theosophy.* C. E. xiv. 26.—C. W. lxi. 182.—D. April, 1892.—M. Jan., Feb., March, 1897.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

In what way does Christian Science conflict with the teachings of the Catholic Church? Were not Christ and the Apostles healers? Is a Catholic allowed to go to Christian Scientists for treatment, provided he does not accept their views? Can any honest man reject as unproved the many cures of Christian Science? Is there any real difference between these cures and the cures at Lourdes in France? Is not faith-healing clearly taught in the New Testament?

The Catholic Church regards Christian Science as an essentially pagan cult; an illogical, incoherent hodge-podge of Pantheism, Manicheism and Idealism.

Mrs. Eddy, its founder, pretended that her mind-cult was a revival of primitive Christianity, and gave it to the world as a new revelation from on high. Her teaching, however, is in no

degree Christian, and its human origin has been clearly traced to Dr. Quimby, a New England mind-healer, whom Mrs. Eddy first met in 1862. She adopted as her own the two cardinal points of his system, *viz.*, that disease and human ills in general have no real existence, and that sickness is cured not by medicines, but by the influence of mind and prayer. Her book, *Science and Health,* which was published in 1875, also shows marked resemblances with the views held by W. F. Evans, whose book, *The Mental Cure,* first saw the light in 1869 (Georgine Milmine, *Life of Mary Baker Eddy*).

It is very difficult to summarize the teachings of Christian Science, because the Bible of the cult, *Science and Health,* is a book full of incoherence, contradictions, illogical reasoning, arbitrary exegesis of Biblical texts, and countless false statements. Many of its pages are unintelligible. As Mark Twain well says: "Of all the strange and frantic and incomprehensible and uninterpretable books which the imagination of man has created, surely this one is the prize sample" (*Christian Science,* 29).

We are naturally puzzled when we read the strange notions evolved through Mrs. Eddy's "spiritual" interpretation of the Bible. For example, Issachar means "corporeal belief"; Jacob "corporeal mortal, embracing duplicity, repentance, sensualism"; Hiddekel "Divine Science, understood and acknowledged"; Asher "Hope and Faith"; and Gihon "the rights of women, morally, civilly, socially!" Are we walking with Alice in Wonderland? "Not at all," her followers answer. "We initiated ones understand her perfectly; but you, as an outsider, being in a condition of 'mortal mind,' are incapable of grasping her wonderful and mysterious message!"

What is this "mortal mind," which figures so prominently in Mrs. Eddy's writings? She tells us it is neither matter which is unreal, or mind, which does not exist apart from the Primal Mind. It is a ghost or phantasm which has no real existence, yet withal this nothingness can explain satisfactorily the erroneous beliefs of non-Christian Scientists.

Despite Mrs. Eddy's denials, a pantheistic concept of the universe underlies all her teachings. God alone is mind, she argues, and alone has true existence. The world, plants, animals and men are simply His ideas, without any real activity of their own. Since God alone is real, all that is opposed to the Divine is unreal. God is spirit; God is good. Matter and evil are opposed to Him; therefore matter and evil have no existence. By such amazing logic Christian Science solves the two great problems of sin and suffering by simply declaring them non-existent.

This ideal world of Mrs. Eddy has a certain attractiveness, which may account in part for some of her following. But with how many gross errors is it connected? It denies the reality of

matter; it denies the trustworthiness of the senses; it denies the existence of secondary causes; it fails to recognize that matter may be the product of spirit, and of a different make-up from spirit, without thereby destroying its supremacy.

Christian Science denies every dogma of the Christian creed, while still claiming the Christian label. It denies the existence of a Personal Creator, the divinity of Christ, the Redemption, the freedom of the will, the fact of original and actual sin, the existence of a divine teaching Church, the sacramental system, the necessity of faith, grace, prayer, asceticism, the resurrection of the body, angels, demons and the eternal sanction of rewards and punishments.

What are we to think of its cures? Those that are real may all be explained by natural causes. It is of course true "that a great many diseases can be wholly produced and completely cured by mental influence alone. Such diseases are purely functional. Other chronic and organic diseases cannot be produced by exclusive mental influences, neither can they be fully cured by unaided psychic power" (Dr. Sadler, *The Psychology of Faith and Fear*).

It is also true that organic disease can be indirectly helped by psychotherapy, which removes obstacles to a cure such as mental depression, and establishes favorable conditions which, either through medicine or through nature, enable the cure to proceed unchecked. These facts are well brought out by Dr. Walsh in his book on Psychotherapy.

But Mrs. Eddy's claim that they are due to the direct action of God, in the sense that the Divine Mind is a negation of disease rather than a cause of cure, is simply an assertion without the slightest shadow of proof.

The miraculous cures of Christ recorded in the Gospels are not to be compared with the cures of the Christian Scientists. For as Dr. Bellward points out:

1. Christ makes no distinction between curable and incurable diseases, but heals them all with equal facility.

2. No visible remedy is employed that could account for these cures.

3. The faith demanded by Christ was a faith in His own Divine mission, and not Mrs. Eddy's "understanding" of the unreality of disease.

4. The cures of Christ were instantaneous and lasting. They were of a nature easily observable by any and all interested enough to investigate.

That the gift of miracles was given the Apostles is clear from the Sacred Scriptures (Mark xvi. 17, 18), and that this gift was to continue in the Church as one of the marks of her divine power is attested by history from the beginning. But the

gift of healing was never intended to be a part of the regular ministry of Christ's priesthood, for it is not an essential to man's salvation. It is always a distinguishing mark of the saints, and at God's good pleasure may often be effected by the divine Sacrament of Extreme Unction.

The miracles wrought at Lourdes by the intercession of the Mother of God are totally different from the cures of modern mind-healers. The medical *Bureau des Constatations,* established in 1882 to test the alleged cures, has ever held that no case should be described as miraculous, if science could suggest any possible natural explanation of the cure. Any doctor, no matter what his religious belief, is welcome at any time to share in the examination of the cures, and as many as five hundred a year have availed themselves of this privilege.

The history of some of the most famous cures at Lourdes may be studied in the pages of Boissarie, *The Work of Lourdes;* Bertrin, *Lourdes;* Grandmaison, *Twenty Cures at Lourdes.*

Catholics are forbidden to go to Christian Science healers for treatment, because such action would necessarily imply a recognition of an anti-Christian cult, and encourage a false, superstitious method of health cure. The Church, while urging humble prayer to God, forbids her children to neglect the ordinary means at their disposal for the cure of disease,—medicines and the skill of doctor and surgeon,—as irrational and sinful. She cites with approval the words of Holy Writ: "Honor the physician for the need thou hast of him; for the Most High has created him. . . . The skill of the physician shall lift up his head, and in the sight of great men he shall be praised. The Most High has created medicines out of the earth, and a wise man shall not abhor them. . . . My son, in thy sickness neglect not thyself, but pray to the Lord, and He shall heal thee" (Ecclus. xxviii. 1-10).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bellwald, *Christian Science and the Catholic Faith;* Benson, *Christian Science;* Lambert, *Christian Science;* Searle, *The Truth About Christian Science;* Thurston, *Christian Science.* C. W. lxxx. 638.—E. T. April 5, April 20, 1922.—M. Jan., Feb., March, 1910.

INDIFFERENTISM

Is not one religion as good as another? Are not creeds in themselves unimportant, and conduct the one thing essential? Do we not frequently meet men who believe in Christ and all His teachings, and yet day by day do things that would bring a blush to a pagan's cheek?

One of the most common dogmas outside the Catholic Church in our day and country is the dogma of indifferentism. The indifferentist will speak patronizingly of religion as a police force to keep the discontented in check, or as an outlet for the emotions of pious sentimentalists. He will praise all religions for the virtuous men they have produced; he will maintain that intelligence and good breeding alike call for a kindly toleration towards all creeds and churches; he will vehemently denounce the Catholic Church as bigoted, intolerant and autocratic, because she claims obedience under sin as the infallible mouthpiece of a divine revelation. There are many roads, he informs you, leading to the kingdom of heaven, and an honest man may travel any one of them with the conviction that he is pleasing God.

You meet the indifferentist everywhere. In educational matters he is a secularist, who marvels greatly at the determined effort made by Catholics to educate their children in separate Catholic schools; in politics he wants the State to ignore religion entirely, and becomes indignant when Church and State work together for the common good; in social questions he advocates many principles subversive of Christian morality, and tells the Church to keep her hands off such questions as divorce, birth control, labor problems and such like issues. In religion he believes that all creeds are equally true and equally helpful—perhaps, down in his heart equally false—and that their acceptance or rejection is as unimportant as the cut of a man's clothes or the customs of his peculiar nationality.

The Catholic Church condemns in most unequivocal terms this modern dogma of indifferentism. She asserts that it is the most subtle enemy of religion, harder to combat successfully than the most bitter prejudice and bigotry. A man who hates the Catholic Church because he thinks she stands for everything unintelligent, ignoble and autocratic, may be led to love her, once he learns that he has been misled by the parents he loves and the teachers he respects. A good hater like St. Paul, who, as he says himself, acted "ignorantly and in unbelief," became, after his conversion, one of the greatest lovers of Jesus Christ. But an indifferentist, who declares God indifferent to truth simply because he himself is indifferent, and who glories in a self-made religion free of all obligation and restraint, is hardly apt to consider the claims of a divine, infallible teaching Church, which requires absolute faith in all the revelation of God, and enforces her divine doctrine and law under penalty of sin.

Is it not strange, however, that the very man who worries night and day over his business troubles, and who sacrifices health and comfort in his pursuit of money, political preferment, or the interests of science, should at the same time be

utterly indifferent to the truth of God? "Seek ye first the kingdom of God," said Jesus Christ (Matt. vi. 33). "What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul? Or what exchange shall a man give for his soul?" (Matt. xvi. 26.)

It is easy to trace the origin of modern indifferentism. It is the inevitable reaction from Luther's false teaching regarding justifying faith. His extreme formula, "Faith alone without works will save," has in the minds of his descendants led to the opposite formula, "Works alone without faith will save." Luther said: "Believe right, and I care not what you do." His follower to-day says: "Do right, and I care not what you believe."

Moreover, Luther's teaching of private judgment, which made man's reason the one supreme arbiter of the revelation of God, led naturally to indifferentism. Sixteenth century Protestantism substituted an infallible book, the Bible, for the infallible Catholic Church, but in practice the meaning of the Bible was left to the private interpretation of the individual. Within a few years this faulty principle gave birth to a number of contradictory versions of Christ's gospel. How was the man in the street to know the true version from the false? Was it not inevitable that lacking the time, the inclination or the ability to study, he would soon conclude that it made no difference what a man believed?

The Catholic Church condemns indifferentism in the name of reason, of the Sacred Scriptures, and of Christian tradition. The God of indifferentism is not a God to be adored by rational men. God is Essential, Absolute and Eternal Truth; He is likewise Essential, Absolute and Eternal Holiness. A God of Truth and Holiness, He cannot be equally pleased with truth and error, with good and evil. To assert, therefore, that God does not care what men believe, is indeed blasphemous. A man indifferent to truth—a liar, in other words,—cannot have the respect of his fellows. A God indifferent to truth could not demand the homage of thinking men. No wonder, then, that those who formed so low a concept of the Deity finally denied Him altogether. Indifferentism is merely atheism in disguise.

The assertion that one religion is as good as another is irrational. It is a first principle of reason that two contradictory statements cannot both be true. If one is true, the other is undoubtedly false. Either there are many gods or one God; either Jesus Christ is God or He is not; Mohammed is either a prophet or an impostor; divorce is either allowed or prohibited by Christ; the Eucharist is the living Jesus Christ or it is mere bread.

To declare all religions equally true, or that their differences are immaterial, is to deny objective truth altogether with the

pragmatist—a denial which is the curse of our age. On this theory a man ought to change his religion as he changes the cut of his clothes, according to his environment. He ought to be a Catholic in Italy, a Lutheran in Sweden, a Mohammedan in Turkey, a Buddhist in China, a Shintoist in Japan.

It is certainly strange that many believers in the Bible are indifferentists, in spite of its clear, explicit condemnation of this theory. Jesus Christ commanded His Apostles to teach a definite Gospel, and condemned those who knowingly rejected it. "Preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be condemned" (Mark xvi. 15, 16). He prophesied that many would gainsay His teaching, but He denounced them in unmeasured terms. "Beware of false prophets who come to you in the clothing of sheep, but inwardly they are ravening wolves" (Matt. vii. 15).

Revelation, if it has any meaning, is a divine message which no one can reject without sin. We must receive it, as the Apostle says, "not as the word of men, but as it is indeed the Word of God" (1 Thess. ii. 13). God, a God of Truth, could not possibly have revealed a plurality of religions, or a multitude of varying Christianities. He founded one Church, one Kingdom of God, one Sheepfold, under the perpetual and infallible guidance of Himself and the Holy Spirit.

The history of Christianity in every age shows how alien to Christ is the dogma of indifferentism, which was first popularized by the English Deists and the French Rationalists of the seventeenth century. In the first three centuries the Christian martyrs died by the thousands, rather than save their lives by a profession of indifferentism. Frequently they were asked by friends and kinsfolk to sacrifice to the gods of pagan Rome, or at least to allow their names to be written down as having sacrificed. "What difference does it make?" asked their pagan friends. They answered in the words of Christ: "Every one, therefore, that shall confess Me before men, I will confess him before My Father who is in heaven. But he that shall deny Me before men, I will also deny him before My Father who is in heaven" (Matt. x. 32, 33). They were not indifferentists.

In sixteenth century England, many a Catholic was offered money, preferment and life, if he would but acknowledge the royal supremacy of the Tudors in things spiritual, against the constant voice of Christendom from the beginning. But men like Blessed Thomas More, Bishop Fisher and Edmund Campion gladly died for the certain teaching of Christ. They were not indifferentists.

As a matter of fact, we find that the man who says first, "It does not make any difference what a man BELIEVES" is

led logically to say, "It does not make any difference what a man DOES." His morality is built upon the shifting sands of opinion, fancy, human respect, and, therefore, will not stand the stress of sorrow, disgrace, difficulty or temptation. If religion be a mere matter of opinion, all certainty in morals becomes impossible, and men lapse into the old-time vices of paganism.

Sometimes the good lives of unbelievers are mentioned as proof positive that belief is an unimportant factor in the regulation of conduct. A man will argue, "*A* never puts his foot inside a church, nor does he accept any creed whatever; yet he is a man, kindly, charitable, pure and honest. On the other hand, *B* is a Catholic, accepting without question every dogma and law of his Church, and I know him to be a drunkard, an adulterer, a hypocrite, the most uncharitable and contemptible of men." But this statement proves nothing at all, because the comparison is made between the open, well-known vices of a sinful, hypocritical believer, and the obvious good deeds of an amiable unbeliever. The whole character of the two men is often not adequately known, and consequently is not weighed in a true balance.

But even if we grant that a particular unbeliever is a fairly good man, his goodness is certainly not due to his unbelief. He lives in a Christian environment; he comes of Christian stock; he may perhaps have received a Christian education as a child. His life is parasitic. As Balfour writes in his *Foundations of Belief*, 82: "Biologists tell us of parasites which live, and can only live in the bodies of animals more highly organized than they. . . . So it is with those persons who claim to show by their example that naturalism is practically consistent with the maintenance of ethical ideals, with which naturalism has no natural affinity. Their spiritual life is parasitic; it is sheltered by convictions which belong not to them, but to the society of which they form a part; it is nourished by processes in which they take no share. And when these convictions decay, and these processes come to an end, the alien life which they have maintained can scarce be expected to outlast them."

If a man be utterly indifferent to the truth of God, if he look upon the Ten Commandments as temporary laws evolved out of the consciousness of a certain Semitic race, if he questions the fact of God's existence, makes little of the fact of immortality, denies the fact of sin, and the freedom of the will, what basis can he have for the moral law? A lawyer, he will not hesitate to bribe both jury and judge, if he can do so without detection; a doctor, he will not shrink from child murder or a criminal operation; a politician, he will steal what he can from the State's treasury, and be loyal to his friends, no matter what their competence or their morals; a preacher of the Gospel of Christ, he

will deny its every doctrine, and be at the beck and call of the rich and powerful among his hearers—a mere "seller of rhetoric," as St. Augustine called him long ago.

The true Christian may under stress of temptation fall into the worst vices of the pagan, and give the lie to his high profession. But no matter how low he may fall, he falls FROM A STANDARD, and you may appeal to him for amendment. He has once climbed up the mount of God, and he knows that with God's help he can again reach the summit. But if a man feels confident that every lapse is due merely to the evil of environment, a taint in the blood, or the impelling force of a stronger will, he will not answer your appeal to higher things. He calls evil good, and good evil.

Will you say that conduct is the one thing essential? You are right. But faith is the inspiration and support of right conduct. It is the very foundation stone of the supernatural life. A good man will accept God's word in its entirety, once he knows it. A good man is bound to search for the revelation of God, once he begins to doubt about the validity of his own ethical and religious convictions. It is just as much a sin to deny the known truth or to be indifferent in its search, as to commit murder or adultery. This is a principle which the modern world has forgotten, but it will have to come back to it. It is a truth that the Catholic Church is ever trying to drive home to every heart and mind. She appeals to all men, however deluded by error or debased by sin, in a spirit of kindliness, tact, sympathy and patience. But she dare not sacrifice one jot or tittle of the divine message, which Christ gave her for the healing of the nations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Conway, *Is There a True Religion?;* Finlay, *Indifferentism;* Harney, *Is One Church As Good As Another?;* McLaughlin, *Indifferentism;* Otten, *Indifferentism.* A. Q. 1891, 764; 1895, 266. —D. T. vii. 1580-1596.

Does not the Bible say that "God is no respecter of persons: But in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him" (Acts x. 34, 35)? Does not this plainly imply that a good and charitable pagan like the centurion could be saved without bothering about creeds or doctrines?

There is not the slightest trace of the dogma of indifferentism in this passage. St. Peter is insisting upon the universal character of the Church Catholic, and teaching that God excludes no one from His Messianic Kingdom, whether Jew or Gentile.

He does not imply that the Pagan is saved by his piety and his natural virtues, but that he is pleasing (*dektos*) to God, because he is well prepared to receive the grace of God, and the

enter His true Church, regardless not of his religion, but of his nationality.

In this same sermon, St. Peter tells his hearers of the necessity of faith and sorrow for sin (Acts x. 43), and he insists on their belief in Christ's divinity, miracles, Death on the Cross, His Resurrection, His coming one day to judge mankind, His fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecies (Acts x. 34-43).

Once Cornelius saw the truth of the Gospel he at once embraced it, and was received into the Church by St. Peter.

Why does the God of truth allow so many religions in the world? As all these religions claim to be true, and a man has not the time to study them all, is not the position of a skeptic or an agnostic perfectly reasonable?

We readily admit that the existence of so many false religions is a great evil, difficult to explain. But because our finite minds cannot fully enter into the secrets of God, must we therefore deny His all-ruling Providence? No, says Balmes: "The evil exists, it is true; but that God's Providence also exists, is no less certain. Apparently these are two things which cannot co-exist; but as you know for certain they do exist, this apparent contradiction is not sufficient to make you deny their existence. What you should do is to seek a means of removing this contradiction, and in case you canr ot possibly discover one, attribute this impossibility to your own inability" (*Letters to a Skeptic,* ii., 24).

The only solution to the problem lies in the mystery of Original Sin, which weakened men's minds and wills, and left them subject to error and sin. St. Paul speaks of pagans who through personal sin "became vain in their thoughts, and their foolish heart was darkened. For professing themselves to be wise, they became fools. And they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of the image of a corruptible man, and of birds, and of four-footed beasts, and of creeping things" (Rom. i. 21-23).

The existence of many false religions should not cause a thinking man to be a skeptic or an agnostic. A counterfeit coin always points to a true original. There is always a way of telling the true coin from the false Divergent views spur on the man of science to further study, so that the working hypotheses of to-day may become the true facts and certain principles of the morrow.

If a man, therefore, is without faith, he ought not cowardly to shrink from studying the problem of the true religion. His reason will tell him that God exists; that God is good and true and loving; that God has spoken His revelation to the creatures He

nas made. His reason will tell him that the New Testament is a book unique among all the books of the world, and that Jesus Christ, whose life it records, said things and did things that no mere man could say or do. If he studies conscientiously, and prays humbly and perseveringly for divine guidance, God will give him grace to know which religion is the true one. He is under no more obligation to study them all than the scientist is bound to study the rejected theories of science.

Why not study the one religion which claims to teach the entire content of divine revelation? The Catholic Church has fulfilled the prophecies of the Old Law, she has weathered centuries of persecution, she has proved her divine witness by many miracles, she has won men's intellects by the sublimity of her doctrine, and has won their hearts by the holiness of her teaching and her saints.

FAITH AND REASON

What scientific proof is there of the divinity of Christianity?

The facts of science can be proved or tested, but what proof have you of things invisible and incomprehensible? I am willing to accept only what I can prove.

A thinking man, who is exercising faith every day in his business, intellectual and social life will not demand of Christianity a proof impossible in the nature of things, but will reasonably investigate the reliability of the authority which claims to voice infallibly the truths of God. He will not ask experimental proof for divine revelation which is over and above reason, but simply ask: What evidence is there that Christ is the Son of God, and His Church divine? He will calmly set aside all passion and prejudice, and study with humility and earnestness the evidences of Christianity: the argument from miracles and prophecy, the absolute perfection of Christ, the unique character of His sublime teaching, the fact of His Resurrection, the marvelous spread and continuance of His Church despite every obstacle, the testimony of the martyrs, the lives of the Church's saints, and the striking transformation of the world effected by the Gospel.

We believe that South Africa exists although we may never have been there, and that Cæsar or Napoleon lived, although they died many years ago. We accept these truths simply on the authority of others. Although the testimony of men may at times be false, because the witness is deceived or a deceiver, still no one ought reasonably to reject the principle of human evi-

dence, any more than he ought to reject ocular testimony because a particular individual is short-sighted or color-blind.

Indeed the very man who boasts of accepting nothing unless he can personally prove it. is daily giving the lie to his pet theory. Most of his knowledge depends not on personal investigation, but on the authority of others. No progress would be possible in any science or art unless a man started with the data gathered by his predecessors. Will an historian of universal history be able to read all the original documents? Will a physicist have time to test every experiment of his forbears? Will a lawyer be able to study every case in the reports, a geographer visit every country, a physician experiment with every drug, before he accepts anything as true? Life is too short and facts too many. And yet men illogically reject the idea of authority in religion. Is it not the way that most of us learn everything we know?

Frequently, too, the same man who accepts without question the human, fallible, hesitating, and ever varying authority of an anti-Christian dogmatism, will refuse assent to a divine, infallible, certain, and unchanging authority. Is not this unreasonable? "If we accept the testimony of men, the testimony of God is greater" (1 John v. 9).

The Gospel of Christ is not for the learned few; it is a Gospel for all. Anyone who comes to it with the humility and docility of the child will learn its mysteries. The Lord said: "Unless you be converted and become as little children, you shall not enter the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. xviii. 13).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Ward, *The Catholic Church and the Appeal to Reason.* A. Q. 1899, 164.—C. W. x. 1; xiv. 145.—D. July, 1889.

MYSTERIES

I cannot accept Christianity, because it compels me to believe incomprehensible mysteries. My reason tells me not to believe anything that I cannot comprehend. Is not reason against faith, and must not one blind himself before he can accept such dogmas as the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement and the Eucharist?

You are most unreasonable, if in the name of reason you refuse to accept the mysteries of Christianity. For there can be no contradiction between reason and faith, because God is the Author of both natural and supernatural truth. St. Thomas well says: "Although the doctrines of faith surpass the truths of human understanding, there can be no opposition between them.

Both proceed from God in their respective orders of grace and nature. And the doctrines of faith become as indubitable through the evidence of the divine authority revealing them, as the primary truths of reason do through their self-evident testimony" (*Contra Gentiles,* i., 7).

The opposition between science and faith, that we hear about so much to-day, is only apparent. It originates either in the errors of scientists who put forth unprovable hypotheses as undoubted facts, or in the mistakes of theologians who teach their private false opinions as Gospel truths. If, as Pope Leo XIII remarked in his Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus,* both would remain within the confines of their own science, real opposition would become impossible.

In fact reason and faith are helpful to each other. Reason gives faith a solid foundation, so that we are not asked to give a blind assent to truths absolutely unknowable, and it also furnishes us strong extrinsic proofs of the content of divine revelation. Faith on the other hand, as Cardinal Newman says, "furnishes facts to the other sciences, which those sciences left to themselves would never reach; and it invalidates apparent facts, which, left to themselves, they would imagine" (*Idea of a University,* 72).

A moment's reflection will convince you that you are surrounded with mystery in this universe. Mystery is in no way peculiar to religion. Science may make continual progress, and tell us of countless new and marvelous facts, but the how and the wherefore of them are utterly beyond its ken.

For example, science tells us that the earth without support of any kind circles around the sun once a year at the rate of sixty-five thousand miles an hour, and yet it never departs from the imaginary line traced for it by a divine geometry; that the sun is over three hundred and fifty thousand times as heavy as the earth, and one million four hundred thousand times more voluminous; that the moon is held to its orbit by the earth's attraction, thereby being constantly brought back to the circular course that it constantly tends to leave; that a ray of light from the star Capella, traveling at the speed of one hundred and eighty-six thousand miles a second, takes seventy-two years to reach the earth; that gravitation on the surface of the sun is twenty-eight times greater than on the surface of the earth; but when science attempts to explain these facts, it can do nothing but coin phrases which only veil the ignorance of their framers. As honest Newton put it: "I know the laws of attraction, but if you ask what attraction is, I really cannot tell."

In fact man only comprehends what he has made himself. He can understand perfectly the mechanism of a watch, because it is his work. But his finite mind cannot comprehend the mys-

teries of God's world, either of nature or of grace. Perfect comprehension and perfect intelligence belong to God alone.

Belief in mysteries is of the very essence of religion. A divine revelation which would only tell us what we already know, or what we could readily discover for ourselves, would be utterly useless and unmeaning. Only from God Himself can we learn about His inner Being (The Trinity), His Infinite condescension (The Incarnation), and His Infinite love of men (The Atonement; the Eucharist).

Our assent to these dogmas is not a blind assent, but a perfectly reasonable assent, that rests solely upon the authority of God, who has revealed them to us. Unreasonable and blind indeed is the rationalist who, without weighing the evidence, refuses *a priori* to accept divine truth.

The Catholic's attitude to the supernatural mysteries of Christianity is most reasonable. "He examines," writes Father McKenna, "the documents of faith, that he may note their value and act accordingly. He knows that life is impossible without religion, and religion without belief; that belief implies authority, and that authority in religion should be the very best. Antecedently, he wishes this to be so; he examines the facts, and his reason is satisfied that it is so. He accepts the supernatural on the authority of God, and bows his reason in homage to truth, which he knows cannot be measured by human thought. He is aware that religion must of its nature rest on truths the evidences of which are not intrinsic" (*The Theology of Faith*, 72).

Bibliography: Bainvel, *Faith and the Act of Faith;* Hettinger, *Revealed Religion;* Lanslots, *Our Reasonable Service;* Vaughan, *Faith and Folly*. A. Q. 1897, 382.—C. W. vii. 338, 464.

Should not a man be perfectly impartial in his study of the Christian evidences, and not be carried away by a wish to believe?

If by impartiality you mean a mere abstract interest in the problem of religion, the inquirer being perfectly indifferent whether the issue of his search be faith or agnosticism, I would answer that such an attitude of mind is fatal to all earnest study. For while on the one hand, a thinking man ought not to be carried away by mere feeling, he must realize that he cannot face the religious problem as he would a theorem in geometry. The religious inquirer knows that the result of his search will affect his happiness here and his eternal welfare hereafter.

The existence of God, the immortality of the soul, the divinity of Christ, the Redemption, the Church, the Sacraments, the sanction of reward and punishment—these are truths which

must be viewed in their practical bearing. There must be a strong desire to know what reason affirms, and what revelation teaches. This supposes a will to believe, which does not make us blindly accept these truths out of mere emotionalism, but makes the seeker after truth careful and critical in his weighing of the evidence.

A person who enters the Catholic Church merely from æsthetic or emotional feelings, will rarely persevere. For while the certitude which gives assurance to the claims of faith is subjective, its every element has its objective counterpart. Without solid motives of credibility, such as miracles and prophecy, we cannot have that moral certitude which leads to faith.

Bibliography: Wilfrid Ward, *The Will to Believe.*

Is faith a mere function of the will? Is it not a mere confidence or trust in the fidelity of God to keep His promises?

No, this false doctrine of Luther destroys the very essence of supernatural faith. Faith may be defined as a supernatural virtue which disposes the mind to assent freely, with certainty, and on the authority of God to all the truths He has revealed. It is essentially an intellectual act, as St. Paul teaches (1 Cor. xiii. 12; 2 Cor. x. 5). St. Paul defines it as "the substance of things to be hoped for, the evidence of things that appear not" (Heb. xi. 1). St. Thomas explains this definition as follows: "When faith is said to be evidence, it is distinguished from opinion, suspicion and doubt, in which the adherence of the intellect to something is unstable; when it is said to be of things that appear not, faith is distinguished from knowledge and understanding by which a thing is apparent; when it is said to be the substance of things to be hoped for, it is distinguished from faith, as commonly understood, which is not directed to happiness or to the object of hope" (IIa. IIae., Q. iv., art. 1).

The assent of faith is directed by the will under the influence of divine grace. The will plays a most important part in the act of faith. St. Paul says that "with the heart, *i. e.*, a good will, we believe unto justice" (Rom. x. 10). Our Lord frequently attributed the unbelief of the Jews to their hardness of heart, and their obstinacy of will (Mark iii. 5; xvi. 13; Luke xxiv. 25). The act of faith is a meritorious act, for the Lord said: "He that believeth shall be saved" (Mark xvi. 16). It must therefore be a free act of the will. A good will puts aside all passion, prejudice, and human respect. It resolutely faces the problems of religion, and does not cease its pursuit of the truth, because the road is beset with difficulties.

Many men fail to believe, not because of intellectual

difficulties, but because the truth goes counter to their passions, imposes obligatory laws, demands of them great sacrifices, and puts definite limits to their independence.

Both intellect and will must receive a special grace from God, before a man can make an act of faith. For as our Lord says: "No man can come to Me, except the Father who has sent Me, draw him" (John vi. 44). Or as St. Paul puts it: "For by grace you are saved through faith, for it is the gift of God" (Eph. ii. 8). The Vatican Council echoes this teaching of the Scriptures, when it declares: "No person can assent to the Gospel teaching with a view to attain salvation, without the illumination and inspiration of the Holy Spirit" (Sess. iii., ch. 3. *On Faith*).

Bibliography: Bainvel, *Faith and the Act of Faith;* Callan, *What Is Faith?;* Gardeil, *La Crédibilité et l'Apologétique;* De Gibergues, *Divine Faith;* Hedley, *Our Divine Saviour;* d'Herbigny, *La Theologie du Réveié;* Holland, *Belief and Freedom;* Hugueney, *Catholicism and Criticism,* xiii.; Hughes, *Talks on Faith;* Juergens, *Newman on the Psychology of Faith;* Lefebvre, *L'Acte de Foi;* McKenna, *The Theology of Faith;* Rivière, *De la Foi;* Smith, *Faith and Dogma.* D. T. vi. 55-514.—I. T. Jan., 1907; Jan., April, 1914.

I envy my Catholic wife and little ones, saying their prayers night and morning with simple faith in God and in Jesus Christ. I would give a great deal to believe as they do, but I honestly cannot. Will God damn me forever for something I cannot help?

God, who is Infinite Justice and Holiness, condemns only those who knowingly sin against the light; *i. e.,* men who know His divine truth and deliberately reject it, and who know His divine law, and deliberately refuse to obey it. The Catholic faith is a gift and a grace of God, which He gives to all men who are rightly disposed to receive it. The very fact that you earnestly desire to believe, is a sure sign that your present state of mind will not be permanent.

Pray daily for this most precious gift, for our Lord has promised, "If you ask the Father anything in My name, He will give it to you" (John xvi. 23).

First of all ask God pardon for your sins, for sinfulness blurs the spiritual vision of many an unbeliever. "The sensual man perceiveth not these things that are of the spirit of God, for it is foolishness to him, and he cannot understand, because it is spiritually examined" (1 Cor. ii. 14). It is frequently a short step from the CONFITEOR to the CREDO; from the act of sorrow to the act of faith. "If any man do the will of Him, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God" (John vii. 17).

Remember that reason, God's own light within the soul, is a gift of God as well as faith. Reason can prove the existence of God, as the Vatican Council teaches, and if you weigh the many arguments which any priest will develop for you, you will soon be convinced of their cumulative force. Reason is also able to study the Scriptures, the history of the Church, and the many proofs from prophecy and miracles attesting the divinity of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

Read a life of Jesus Christ—by Didon, Elliott, Fillion, or Fouard—and sooner or later the conviction will come that He is God, calling for the perfect submission of your intellect and will. Only one Church—the Church Catholic—dares teach as He taught with divine infallible certainty; only one Church claims His divine pardoning power over the sins of men; only one Church is founded on Peter, the Rock, teaching everywhere the same Gospel that Jesus and the Apostles gave the world.

Do not expect to comprehend the mysteries of the Gospel, for God's revelation cannot be fully grasped by any finite intellect. Do not look for mathematical evidence in matters of faith, for God could not promise you a reward for a forced assent to His truth. He demands of us a free and a willing service. Do not be dismayed by difficulties, saying with the unbelieving Jew of old, "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" or with the modern unbeliever, "How could a good God make an eternal hell?" Ask rather whether Jesus Christ claimed powers that no mere man could claim, and did things that no mere man could do. As Cardinal Newman said: "Ten thousand difficulties do not make one doubt."

THE BLESSED TRINITY

I cannot believe in an absurd contradiction in terms like the Trinity. How can you declare that one is three and three are one?

While we grant that the dogma of the Blessed Trinity is an absolute mystery, which unassisted reason could never discover, nor even recognize as possible, we deny that it involves any contradiction. A mere statement of the doctrine will make this clear.

In God there are three Persons in one Divine Essence, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, really distinct, equal and of one substance. The father is Unbegotten, the Son Begotten of the Father, and the Holy Ghost Proceeds from the Father and the Son (*2 Council of Lyons,* 1274). All things in God are common to the three Persons, and are one and the same, except

where there is the opposition of relation (*Decree of Eugenius IV for the Jacobites*). The divine activity is common to the Three Persons, who are the One Principle of all things. As the words *one* and *three* refer to two essentially different things, *NATURE* and *PERSON,* there can be no question of any contradiction of terms. Three persons who possess human nature are rightly called three men, because the human nature in each is not numerically the same; the Three Persons who have the Divine Nature are not three gods, because the Divine Nature is numerically the same in each one of them. How this can be we can never comprehend. We accept this doctrine only because it has been revealed to us by God Himself.

The dogma of the Trinity was revealed to us by Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who alone could teach us concerning the intimate life of God (Matt. xi. 27). It is taught on every page of the New Testament, and has been handed down, together with the Incarnation, by the Church's divine tradition, as a doctrine which distinguishes Christianity from all other religions. That it was in no way derived either from the Jew or Pagan has been shown in the two volumes of Lebreton's *Histoire du Dogma de la Trinité.*

The Trinity is clearly mentioned in the account of the Incarnation given by St. Luke (i. 32, 33), in St. Matthew's description of the Baptism of Christ (iii. 16, 17), in our Lord's discourse at the Last Supper (John xiv. 11, 16), and in His divine commission to the Apostles (Matt. xxviii. 19; *Cf. C. E.,* xv., 48). It is set forth explicitly in the baptismal formula, which all critics acknowledge to be primitive, in the doxologies (doxe= glory), or divine praises to the Three Divine Persons which were known as early as the first century, and in all the early Fathers, especially of the third and fourth centuries in both East (St. Athanasius, St. Basil, St. Gregory of Nazianzus and St. Gregory of Nyssa) and West (St. Hilary, St. Augustine), when the doctrine was denied from every possible viewpoint.

For the meaning of the terms, Essence, Nature, Substance, Person, Generation, Procession, Relation, etc., consult Hunter's *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology,* ii., 147-152.

Bibliography: Blount, *The Blessed Trinity;* Choppin, *La Trinité chez les Pères Apostoliques;* Hugon, *Le Mystère de la très Ste. Trinité;* Newman, *The Arians of the Fourth Century;* Pohle, *The Divine Trinity;* De Regnon, *Etudes sur la Trinité.* C. E. xv. 47-57.—C. W. iii. 758.—D. A. iv. 1848-1883.—E. T. Feb. 20, 1919.

MIRACLES

How are miracles possible, when we know that the laws of nature are fixed and immutable? Is not a miracle a violation of nature's laws?

It is good at the outset to define our terms. What is a law of nature? A uniform mode of acting which a natural agent observes under the same circumstances. Thus fire will always burn, and nitric acid will cauterize a normal human skin; a broken bone will take some time to knit together; water will freeze at 32 degrees Fahrenheit and boil at 212 degrees; apple trees will bring forth apples, and "great oaks from little acorns grow."

What is a miracle? An event that involves a change in this general order of things. It has been defined as "a sensible fact which is beyond the natural power of every created agency, and which manifests an immediate and extraordinary intervention of divine Omnipotence."

Although experience proves that nature generally works according to fixed unchangeable laws, these laws are not, like the laws of mathematics, intrinsically and absolutely necessary. Natural agents exercise a true causality. The reason why the effect is what it is, must be found in the properties of the agent. As free will does not enter into their activity, the same agent in the same circumstances will always act in the same way. But no created cause can act without the concurrence of God. God, the First Cause, can in His Omnipotence and Wisdom intervene in the action of these secondary causes. He does so in a particular case, so that men may be led to accept His divine revelation, or to acknowledge His divine power. Nature is what God orders. The physical order must yield to the moral; God is independent of the laws He has established.

When God works a miracle, our scientific knowledge is just as true as it was before. The fact that iron is heavier than water remains generally true, even if God once made an axe-head to float (4 Kings vi. 5-7); fire will generally burn, even if God once preserved His three faithful followers in Nabuchodonosor's fiery furnace (Dan. iii. 24); the knitting together of a broken bone will generally take a long time, even if God once instantaneously cured it, as He did in the case of Pierre de Rudder, of Oostacker, Belgium, in 1875 (Bertrin, *Lourdes,* 164-184).

Is it not strange that men like Huxley, who declared science and miracles incompatible, should at the same time hold that "the universal law of causation cannot be proved by any amount of experience" (*Essays,* ix., 121). Catholics are more scientific,

because they base the principle of uniformity on the theory that the nature of the effect is derived from the cause.

A miracle, therefore, is not a violation of nature's laws. God in certain rare instances simply intervenes to suspend their ordinary activities for some divine, supernatural purpose.

Bibliography: Devas, *The Key to the World's Progress,* xi.; Folghera, *Newman's Apologetic,* ii.; Hugueney, *Catholicism and Criticism,* xii.; Knox, *Miracles;* Poulpiquet, *Le Miracle et ses Suppléances;* Rickaby, *The Lord My Light,* 181-191. C. W. xxxiii. 433; xlix. 366; liv. 194; cx. 221.—E. March, 1916.—I. T. Jan., 1919.—M. Feb., 1925.—R. C. l. 675.

Do not miracles argue a change in an unchangeable God?

By no means. There can be no intrinsic change in God, as the Bible teaches: "I am the Lord and I change not" (Mal. iii. 6; *Cf.* James i. 17). The creation of the world did not imply any change in God, for by an eternal free decree He determined to produce the world out of nothing, and fixed the time of its commencement and its end. God is an Eternal, Omnipotent, Omniscient Being; all actual creatures—past, present and future—together with all their actions and all the circumstances of their existence, were present to His mind from all eternity.

Are not miracles incompatible with the wisdom of God, introducing as they do "the notion of caprice and special legislation among God's laws of nature" (Mahaffy, *Hibbert Journal,* April, 1903)?

No, once we recognize the distinction, between the physical and moral orders. "Doubtless the laws of nature are the best laws possible with a view to God's physical government of the world. But it does not follow that for His moral government, that is, for the guidance of souls to their eternal destiny, no better plan can be followed than to allow the laws of nature to pursue their course unchecked" (Joyce, *The Question of Miracles,* 18).

May not miracles be due to certain unknown laws of nature? Has not modern science proved that things our forefathers would have deemed miraculous, have now become the commonplaces of everyday experience? Will not the science of the future render all miracles explainable by natural means?

Some pseudo-miracles of healing, rashly attributed to God's miraculous power, may be explained on the supposition that some

unknown law may have produced them. But we know enough of nature's laws to distinguish the real miracle from the counterfeit. We know to a certainty, for example, that blindness is not cured by spittle (Mark viii. 23); that leprosy is not cured by the touch of a hand (Matt. viii. 3); that the dead do not arise at the sound of a voice (John xi. 43); that five thousand people cannot be fed with five loaves and two fishes (Matt. xiv. 19).

The instantaneous character of many of the cures at Lourdes, which may be studied in the pages of Boissarie's *The Work of Lourdes,* Dr. Bertrin's *Lourdes,* and Grandmaison's *Twenty Cures at Lourdes,* is proof positive against the hypothesis of unknown natural laws. These sick people at Lourdes undergo no sanitorium treatment, but prayerfully and humbly ask God to work a cure through His Mother's intercession. The many cures affected cannot honestly be gainsaid by any man who carefully weighs the evidence.

If we take into account the general unreliability of human testimony, how can any particular miracle be certainly proved? Does not the evidence in most cases come from simple minded men, who are really incompetent to judge in such matters?

We readily grant that some simple minded souls, anxious for a cure, may be deceived regarding the supernatural character of their healing. That is the reason why the *Bureau des Constatations* was established at Lourdes as early as 1867 to distinguish scientifically the true from the counterfeit miracle.

But as a miracle is a sensible fact, it can be known either by the testimony of the senses, or the testimony of reliable witnesses. The man in the street can testify as well as any scientist to the instantaneous cure of a leper (Luke xvii. 11), or of a man blind from birth (John ix. 1); to Christ walking upon the waters (Matt. xiv. 25), changing the water into wine (John ii. 1), or stilling the storm with a word (Matt. viii. 26).

The committee of scientists that Renan demanded to authenticate a true miracle might prove the poorest possible witnesses, if they refused to divest themselves of their preconceived notions of the impossibility of the miraculous and the supernatural. Our Lord would say of them as He once said to the unbelieving disciples: "Having eyes, see you not? and having ears, hear you not?" (Mark viii. 18.)

Do not all religions claim their miracles? What special proving power, therefore, have the miracles of Christ and of Christianity?

The alleged wonders of non-Christian religions can all be traced to fraud, hallucination, hypnotic suggestion, psychotherapy, or diabolism; they are often absurd, ridiculous and meaningless legends and myths, utterly devoid of authenticity.

Our Lord Himself warned us that "many false prophets shall arise and shall seduce many" (Matt. xxiv. 11), and St. Paul tells us of the "lying wonders" of antichrist (2 Thess. ii. 8, 9).

The so-called wonders at the shrine of Æsculapius in Epidaurus were not miracles. The sick person slept in the temple, hoping that the god would vouchsafe him a helpful dream. The priests interpreted each dream, and the physicians of the time prescribed the best remedies they knew.

The wonders, ascribed to Simon Magus and to Elymas in the Acts of the Apostles (viii. 9; xiii. 8), like some of the wonders of modern spiritism, may be ascribed to fallen spirits.

The wonders of Apollonius of Tyana are only to be found in a legendary romance, written one hundred years after his death by Philostratus, at the command of the Empress Julia Domna.

The wooden birds that fly in the apocryphal Gospels, the five hundred white lions and the dragon-harnessed chariot of Buddha, the moon-dividing of Mohammed, are all fantastic, childish, and extravagant tales, calculated to astonish the unthinking multitude, without in any way proving divine intervention.

The miracles of Christ and of Christ's Church are, on the contrary, never meaningless or ridiculous, but evidence always God's Omnipotence, Mercy, Kindness, or Justice.

Our Savior worked miracles to prove His divine mission to the unbelieving Jews, and to establish the divine character of His revelation (Grandmaison, *Jesus Christ*, ii., 313-368). He has allowed His saints to work miracles to prove their divine commission to speak in His name, and to give the world a clear proof of their eminent sanctity. The Church always requires four, or in some instances six, miracles before she proceeds to beatify or canonize a saint (Macken, *The Canonization of Saints*, 188). The miracles of healing, granted at shrines like Lourdes (Boissarie, *The Work of Lourdes*), prove that God's hand is not shortened (Num. xi. 23; Isa. l. 2), and that He loves to reward the ardent faith of His followers.

Catholics accept all the miracles of the Old Testament and the New, because these books are divinely inspired, and in a true sense have God for their author. Catholics deem it an insult to God to maintain, as some non-Catholics do, that miracles ended with the Apostles; they know they are ever being worked in the Church as an evident sign of her holiness and her divine character. The evidence for any particular miracle in the lives of the Saints must be weighed according to the evi-

dence, as any other historical fact. Catholic scholars are most critical in distinguishing the true miracle from the popular legend (Delehaye, *The Legends of the Saints*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Boedder, *Natural Theology;* De Bonniot, *Le Miracle et ses Contrefaçons;* Brunsmann, *Fundamental Theology,* ii., 74-139; Gutberlet, *Vernunst und Wunder;* Joyce, *The Principles of Natural Theology; The Question of Miracles;* Newman, *Two Essays on Miracles;* Sortais, *La Providence et le Miracle;* Tonquedec, *Introduction à l'Etude du Miracle;* Van Hove, *Le Doctrine du Miracle chez S. Thomas;* Windle, *Miracles and Other Essays.* A. Q. April, 1898.—C. E. x. 338-348.—D. A. iii. 518-578.—I. T. Oct., 1910.—M. Jan., 1877.

THE GENUINENESS OF THE GOSPELS

Your account of Christ depends on the four Gospels. How can we be sure to-day that they are genuine history? May they not have been written long after the events they record? May they not be mere legends or myths, as many non-Christian critics maintain?

According to a well-established tradition the three Synoptic Gospels (*i. e.,* written from a common point of view), were written between the years 50 and 70, and the Fourth Gospel between 80 and 100. The same tradition attributed them certainly to the publican Levi, afterwards St. Matthew; to Mark, the disciple of St. Peter; to Luke, the physician and friend of St. Paul; to St. John, the Apostle, the son of Zebedee.

Modern rationalistic critics have denied this tradition, not in the name of history, but in the name of preconceived theories, which questioned the possibility of the supernatural and the miraculous. The utter failure of their attempt to undermine the genuineness of the Gospels may be studied in the best treatise we know on this subject, Felder's *Christ and the Critics.*

The arguments for their genuineness may thus be summarized: 1. The writers of the first three centuries were all acquainted with the four Gospels, cited them repeatedly, and took for granted their high place in the Church's teaching. We mention the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, the Epistle of Barnabas, St. Clement of Rome, St. Ignatius of Antioch, St. Polycarp of Asia Minor, Papias of Hierapolis, Aristides of Athens, Justin Martyr of Rome, Tertullian of Africa, St. Irenæus of Lyons, St. Clement of Alexandria, and Origen. These writers do not give us merely their personal opinion, but express clearly the faith of the universal Church.

2. The first enemies of Christianity—the Pagans, the Jews and heretics—although they ridiculed the contents and credibility of the Gospels, never dreamt of denying their genuineness, which would have been for them the best possible argument.

3. The apocryphal Gospels, which were everywhere denounced by the Church as non-apostolic, and spurious, fabulous and fantastic travesties of the true Gospels, prove the genuineness of the original four, as counterfeit coins prove the existence of the originals they imitate.

4. The Gospels themselves indicate in the clearest possible manner their Apostolic origin. Although our oldest manuscripts of the Bible date only from the fourth and fifth centuries, this is a comparatively old date, if we remember that manuscripts of the Latin and Greek classics, whose authenticity men commonly admit, date at best from the eighth and ninth centuries. The Gospels give us a perfect picture of Palestinian Judaism before the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70. The political, religious and social life of the times is accurately depicted to the most minute details. Their intimate knowledge of the life and active ministry of Christ proves that they originated in the immediate circle of the Apostles and their disciples.

5. There was no likelihood of the Gospels undergoing any substantial change, because they were known and read in all the churches, and copies and versions were continually being made. The Christian Doctors of the first three centuries cited them frequently in their writings and sermons, and so convinced were they of their divine character that any change would have been instantly noted.

6. That the Gospels are true, reliable and credible is proved indirectly by the failure of the liberal critics of the past one hundred and fifty years to discredit them. Theory has followed theory—Reimarus' theory of deception, the natural explanation of Paulus, the mythical theory of Strauss, the tendency hypothesis of Baur, the evolutionary hypothesis of Ritschl and Harnack—only to prove that their authors read into the text their own *a priori* notions, and gave their readers merely the result of their imaginings, their prejudices, and their arbitrary and contradictory hypotheses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Arendzen, *The Gospels: Fact, Myth or Legend;* Felder, *Christ and the Critics,* 9-94; Grannan, *General Introduction to the Bible;* Lagrange, *L'Evangile selon S. Matthieu, S. Marc, S. Luc and S. Jean;* Pope, *Student's Aids to the Bible,* ii.; Simon, *A Scripture Manual,* ii. C. W. lvii. 593; lviii. 376.—I. T. Oct., 1908.

THE INCARNATION

What do Christians mean by the Incarnation? Is this theological subtlety taught in the New Testament? Is it not contrary to reason that God could become man, or a man God? Does not this teaching imply a change in the unchangeable Deity?

The mystery of the Incarnation is the unique and marvelous union of the Divine Nature and the Human Nature in the one Person of the Word Made Flesh, Christ Jesus. We call this union unique, because no other being is constituted in this way; and marvelous, because it is brought about only by God's Infinite Power and Love.

In the Incarnation the two Natures are united in one substantial whole, the divine Person Jesus Christ, as the body and soul, to use an analogy of the Athanasian Creed, are united in one substantial human person. Yet these two Natures remain strictly distinct; the lower does not in any way influence the higher, while the higher only influences the lower as it would do even if it were separated.

The mystery lies in the fact that the two Natures constitute one single Person, although they are not fused into one single Nature. The Word of God takes the place of the human personality, and makes the humanity so completely its own, that this Humanity belongs to the Word, and must be adored with Him and in Him.

It is true that the Bible does not contain the precise theological formula of "two Natures in one Person," but it expresses its identical meaning clearly in many a passage. The same Jesus Christ is Son of God and Son of Man, begotten of the Father from all eternity, and born of the Blessed Virgin in time. St. John in the Prologue of his Gospel, states the doctrine with a clearness and a beauty never equaled, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God . . . And the Word was made Flesh and dwelt among us" (John i. 1, 14).

St. Paul often teaches that Christ is God and Man at the same time. He is "God's Son, who was made to Him of the seed of David, according to the flesh"; "God sent His own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh"; "In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead corporeally"; "Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men" (Rom. i. 3; viii. 3; Col. ii. 9; Phil. ii. 6, 7).

Although the Incarnation is indeed a transcendent mystery which never could be discovered by the unaided reason, it is not

against reason. Reason can prove that Christ claimed equality with God, and that He confirmed His claim to be divine by miracles (John x. 25). Reason also can illustrate the Incarnation by comparisons and analogies. St. Augustine, for example, speaks of the intellectual concept, which clothes itself in a sense-form, speech, without losing anything of its spirituality. The Athanasian Creed lays stress upon the analogy of the union of soul and body. Moreover, the Incarnation satisfies God's desire to give Himself to us, and man's insatiable longing for the Infinite. "What I vaguely dreamt of," writes Monsabré, "has become certain; faith justifies and confirms the most profound hopes of my philosophy. There is no incoherence in this doctrine, no contradiction, or absurdity, nothing unbecoming nor extravagant. The Divine Nature espoused the Human Nature without any detriment to the one or any alteration in the other; both are complete, perfect, distinct, subsisting in the same Person" (Conference 34, Lent, 1878).

There is no change whatsoever in God. "God, in becoming Incarnate, loses nothing, receives nothing, is not in any way impoverished or enriched, but He terminates, completes and perfects the Human Nature. The change is in the Human Nature which is raised up to the Divine Being, not in the Person who raises it and renders it divine. The Eternal does not change on this account any more than the cupola of St. Peter's at Rome changes, when seen by the pilgrim for the first time. The change is entirely in the visitor; the monument remains the same, and there only happens to come into being a new reality, namely, the knowledge of the visitor which did not exist before" (Hugon, *The Mystery of the Incarnation,* 45).

Bibliography: Arendzen, *Whom Do You Say?;* Hedley, *Our Divine Saviour;* Lattey (ed.) 1925, *The Incarnation;* Pohle, *Christology;* Walker, *Why God Became Man.* D. T. vii. 1445-1538.

DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART OF JESUS

Does not your devotion to the Sacred Heart imply the rendering of divine honor to a creature? Does not modern physiology deny the erroneous belief that the heart is the seat of love? Is there any proof of the authenticity of the Great Promise? Is it not heretical to hold that one has a certainty of salvation?

The legitimacy of the devotion to the Sacred Heart is understood by all who have a perfect grasp of the dogmas of the

Incarnation and the Redemption. Jesus Christ is perfect God and perfect Man in one Divine Personality. The divine Person is united hypostatically not only to the Humanity of Christ considered in its totality, but also considered in its several parts, as for instance, His Hands, His Feet, His Precious Blood, and His Heart. It follows, therefore, that every one of these organic parts is deserving of adoration, not considered in itself, but in view of its union with the Godhead.

The Jansenist theory that a direct adoration of the Humanity of Christ or any part thereof is equivalent to rendering divine honor to a creature was condemned by Pius VI. The Sacred Heart of Jesus is worthy of the same worship as His divinity, provided it is worshipped conjointly with His Person.

In this devotion the Heart is not viewed as the organ, but only as the symbol of love. Just as the lily represents purity and the scale symbolizes justice, so the heart suggests the thought of love. The Bible speaks of the heart as the ideal seat of the affections (Isa. lxv. 14; Prov. xxiii. 17; 1 Tim. i. 5), the source of desire and volition (Matt. xv. 19), and assigns to it intellectual operations (Deut. xi. 18; xxiii. 46; 1 Cor. ii. 9).

The original letter containing the Great Promise has been lost, but it has come down to us in five different versions. The first is found in the first volume of the 1867 and 1876 Visitandine editions of the *Life and Works of Margaret Mary;* the second in the second volume of the same two editions; the third in the Life by Bishop Languet; the fourth in a manuscript discovered by Father Hamon in 1902, in the library of Joseph Déchelette; the fifth in the annals of the Monastery of Dijon. It is impossible to determine which of these is the original version.

All the versions agree in insisting upon Communion for Nine First Fridays, and in promising the grace of final repentance, and the grace of not dying without the Sacraments. Bishop Languet's version declares that after one has complied with the required conditions, HE MAY ENTERTAIN A HOPE of receiving the Sacraments, and the grace of final perseverance. The first version adds the words "if she be not mistaken," proving that there was no infallible efficacy attached to the devotion of the Nine Fridays.

No one has any right to presume that his salvation is secure irrespective of the life he lives in the future, provided he makes the Nine Fridays. By the very fact of sinning, he loses his title to this special divine assistance.

The devout lover of Christ by frequent Communion will be given many graces, which "may lead him to hope for the grace of final repentance," as Bishop Languet says. His words say nothing of an absolute infallible assurance of salvation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bainvel, *Devotion to the Sacred Heart;* Conway,

Devotion to the Sacred Heart; Hamon, *La Dévotion au Sacré Cœur;* Petrovitz, *Devotion to the Sacred Heart;* Vermeersch, *Devotion to the Sacred Heart.*

Does the Old Testament tell of Jesus the Messias?

Yes, for over two thousand years the prophets of the Old Law declared that God had revealed to them the coming of Jesus, the Messias, who was to be the Redeemer of the world.

God promises a Redeemer to Adam (Gen. iii. 15). He is to be of the stock of Sem (Gen. ix. 26), of Abraham (Gen. xxii. 18), of Isaac (Gen. xxvi. 4), of Jacob (Gen. xxviii. 14; Num. xxiv. 17), of the tribe of Juda (Gen. xlix. 8-10; *Cf.* Heb. vii. 14), and of the family of David (Isa. ix. 7; *Cf.* Rom. vii. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 8).

Moses declares that He will be a great Prophet (Deut. xviii. 18), Isaias says that His coming will be preceded by a universal peace (Isa. ii. 4), and Malachias writes of His precursor (Mal. iii. 1). He is to be born of a Virgin (Isa. vii. 14), in the city of Bethlehem (Mich. v. 2), before the complete subjection of Israel, and the destruction of the second temple (Gen. xlix. 10; Dan. ix. 24-27).

The prophets continually style the Messias the Lord (Ps. ii. 2), Jesus or the Savior (Isa. ii. 5; Habac. iii. 8), the Mighty God (Isa. ix. 6), the Emmanuel, or God with us (Isa. vii. 14), the Father of the world to come, the Prince of Peace (Isa. ix. 6).

They tell us of His poverty (Ps. lxxxvi. 16), His obedience and meekness (Ps. xxxix. 9; cxix. 7), His public preaching (Isa. ix. 1, 2; *Cf.* Matt. iv. 15), His miracles (Isa. xxxv. 5, 6), His founding of an universal, eternal kingdom (Ps. xliv. 7, 8; Ps. ii. 7, 8).

They tell us that Christ will be a rock of scandal, and the occasion of ruin for many (Isa. viii. 14; *Cf.* Luke ii. 34), that He will be sold for thirty pieces of silver (Zach. xi. 12), led as a lamb to the slaughter (Isa. liii. 7), to be crucified (Zach. xiii. 6), while the people mock Him (Jer. xx. 7; Ps. xxi. 8; *Cf* Matt. xxxvii. 40-42), the soldiers cast lots for His garments (Ps. xxi. 19; *Cf.* Matt. xxvii. 35), and offer Him vinegar to drink (Ps. lxviii. 22; *Cf.* Matt. xxvii. 34). His sepulchre shall be glorious (Isa. xi. 10), His body free from corruption (Ps. xv. 10), and He shall dwell at the right hand of God (Ps. xv. 11) to pour forever His Spirit upon all flesh (Joel ii. 28).

In the light of the New Testament these many prophecies prove that Christ was divine. Job identifies the Messias with God: "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and in the last day I shall rise out of the earth . . . and in my flesh I shall see my God" (Job xix. 25, 26). The Psalms, the sublime hymn book of

Israel, declare that the Messias is the Eternal God, whose reign shall be for everlasting: "Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee" (Ps. ii. 7; *Cf.* Acts xiii, 33; Heb. i. 5). "Thy throne is forever and ever . . . God, Thy God has anointed Thee (Ps. xliv. 7, 8; *Cf.* Heb. i. 8). Jesus Christ was "The Expectation of Israel, the Savior" as the prophet Jeremias foretold (xiv. 8), the "Consolation of Israel," so confidently awaited by the aged Simeon (Luke ii. 25).

Christ Himself always claimed to have fulfilled the prophecies. He said: "Search the Scriptures . . . the same are they that give testimony of Me" (John v. 39). Quoting Isaias (lxi. 1) in the synagogue of Nazareth, He declared: "This day is fulfilled the Scriptures in your ears" (Luke iv. 21). When the woman of Samaria spoke of the Messias to come, He said to her, "I am He who am speaking with thee" (John iv. 26). When the disciples on the road to Emmaus did not recognize Him as the Risen Christ He, "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, expounded to them in all the Scriptures, the things that were concerning Him" (Luke xxiv. 27).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Brunsmann, *Fundamental Theology,* ii., 555-598; Lattey (ed.), *The Incarnation,* i.; Lepin, *Jesus the Messias;* Maas *Christ in Type and Prophecy.*

Did Christ ever claim to be God in the Synoptic Gospels? Was not the doctrine of the divinity of Christ borrowed by St. Paul from the pagan mystery religions, or the Jewish Apocalypses?

Yes, Christ claims to be God on every page of St. Matthew, St. Luke and St. Mark. We readily admit that they do not teach the divinity of Christ in so marked and so direct a manner as St. John, for their main purpose was to prove that Jesus is the Christ, *i. e.,* the Messias, the descendant and antitype of David, the Expectation and the Hope of Israel. "Whatever deeds or sayings of Christ," says Father Otten, "were calculated to bring out that point clearly and distinctly were appropriately placed in the foreground, whilst His divine Personality received only such passing notice as was necessary to set forth the full sense of its Messianic character" (*What Think You of Christ?,* 24).

In the Sermon on the Mount Christ identifies Himself with Jehovah of Sinai, speaking not like the prophets: "Thus saith the Lord," but as God Himself: "I say to you" (Matt. v. 22, 28, 32, 34, 39, 44). As God He declares Himself Lord of the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 8; Mark ii. 28; Luke vi. 5), the Judge of all men (Matt. x. 32; xiii. 40-43; xvi. 27, 28; Mark viii. 38, 39; Luke xvii. 30; xxi 27), the Pardoner of men's sins (Matt. ix. 2-7; Mark ii. 3-12; Luke v. 18-26), the Eternal Being "who

CINCINNATI BIBLE SEMINARY
5955
282

dwelt from everlasting with His Father" (Matt. vii. 21; x. 34; xxi. 33-41; Mark xii. 1-9; Luke x. 18; xx. 8-16).

Christ, as the Son of God, claims to be equal with His Father in knowledge, and therefore in Nature. "No one knoweth the Son but the Father; neither doth anyone know the Father but the Son" (Matt. xi. 27; Luke x. 22). He knows that God His Father knows our needs (Matt. vi. 32; Luke xii. 30); that He will answer our prayers (Matt. xxi. 22; Mark xi. 23); that He will reward a cup of cold water given in His name (Matt. x. 42; Mark ix. 40); that He would, if asked, send legions of angels to succor Him (Matt. xxvi. 53).

Christ as God knows the innermost thoughts of men, whether they are absent or present (Matt. ix. 4; xii. 25; xvi. 17; Mark ii. 8; viii. 17; Luke vi. 8; ix. 47). The future is to Him like an open book, for He prophesies His betrayal by Judas and His denial by Peter (Matt. xxvi. 21; xxii. 34), His Passion, Death and Resurrection (Matt. xvi. 21; Mark ix. 20; Luke ix. 22), the destruction of Jerusalem (Matt. xxiii. 35), the Last Judgment and the end of the world (Matt. xviii. 35; xxiv.; Mark xiii.; Luke xxi.).

St. Luke frequently calls Christ "the Lord" (Luke vii. 31; x. 1; 39-41; xi. 39; xvii. 5; xviii. 6; xix. 8; xxii. 31), and the Synoptic Gospels speak of Christ as the Son of God twenty-four times. God the Father proclaims Him from on high as His well-beloved Son, and sends the angel Gabriel to the Virgin Mary, telling her that Jesus her Son "shall be the Son of the Most High." The Apostles acknowledge Christ as the Son of God, when He calms the storm on the Lake of Galilee, while St. Peter, taught by divine revelation, declares Him "the Son of the living God" at Cæsarea Philippi (Matt. i. 20; iii. 17; xvi. 16; xvii. 5; xxvii. 24; Mark. i. 11; xv. 39; Luke iii. 22; ix. 35; xxiii. 47). When Christ is solemnly asked by the High Priest at His trial: "Art Thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed God?" Jesus answers plainly: "I am" (Mark xiv. 61, 62; *Cf.* Matt. xxvi. 63, 64; Luke xxii. 70), and for this claim He was condemned to death as a blasphemer (Mark xiv. 64).

The countless miracles (Matt. ix. 35; Mark vi. 55; Luke iv. 46) which Christ wrought in His own name and by His own power prove Him to be God. When the Jews questioned His testimony, He appealed to the miracles He had wrought as proof positive of His equality with Jehovah, whom He called His Father (Matt. xi. 4; *Cf.* John v. 36; x. 38; xiv. 12). He stills the storm with a word (Matt. viii. 23-27; Mark iv. 39); He walks upon the surface of the Lake, and feeds five thousand men and women with a few loaves and fishes (Matt. xiv. 25; 16-21); He drives out demons from the possessed (Matt. viii. 16. 29; Mark i. 24; iii. 12; Luke iv. 34, 41; viii. 28); He cures

the blind, the dumb, the paralytic and the leper (Matt. ix. 28, 32, 27; viii. 3), the servant of the centurion and the daughter of the woman of Canaan (Matt. viii. 53; xv. 28); He reveals His Divine Nature in the glory of the Transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 1-9), and in the triumph of the Resurrection (Matt. xxviii. 6; Mark xvi. 6; Luke xxiv. 6).

The prophets of the Old and the saints of the New Law also perform miracles, but they always do so in the name of God and of Christ Jesus. Christ alone performs them of Himself: "I will, be thou made clean." "Do you believe that I can do this unto you" (Matt. viii. 3; ix. 28; *Cf.* Luke vii. 14).

The unbelievers of our day have attempted to rewrite the life of Christ, without accepting His miracles. But as Liddon well says: "To expel miracles from the life of Jesus is to destroy the identity of the Christ of the Gospels; it is to substitute a new Christ for the Christ of Christendom. . . . These rationalistic commentators do not affect to take the history as it has come down to us. As the Gospel narratives stand, they present a block of difficulties to humanitarian theories; and these difficulties can only be removed by mutilations of the narrative so wholesale and radical as to destroy their substantial interest, besides rendering the retention of the fragments which may be retained a purely arbitrary procedure. . . . The moral integrity of our Lord's character is dependent, whether we will or not, upon the reality of His miracles" (*The Divinity of Christ,* 161, 163).

Christ, the most unselfish and humble of men (Matt. ix. 30; xi. 29; xxvi. 39; Mark viii. 11; Luke viii. 51), demands and obtains absolute obedience from the Apostles (Matt. iv. 18; ix. 9; Mark ii. 14; Luke v. 27), and insists upon love and service from His disciples even unto persecution and death. Father, mother, children, lands, monies—all are to be set at naught when He calls. "He that loveth father or mother more than Me, is not worthy of Me." . . . "He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that shall lose his life for Me shall find it" (Matt. x. 37, 39; *Cf.* xi. 28-30; xvi. 24, 25; Luke ix. 23-26). Only God could make such absolute demands upon our minds and hearts.

Many an unbeliever—Harnack, Hegel, Kant, Renan, Spinoza, Straus, Mill—has acknowledged the surpassing eminence of the character of Christ. He certainly claimed to be God. If His claim were false, He is not even a good man. As St. John says: "He that believeth not the Son maketh Him a liar" (John v. 10). But we know that He is "the One that is good, God" (Matt. xix. 17).

Catholic scholars have proved clearly that St. Paul did not derive his belief in Christ's divinity from either the pagan or the Jew (Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul,* ii., 115, 125; Bandus, *The Master Idea of St. Paul's Epistles,* 146-171). As he

himself bears witness, he learned it from divine revelation. "I give you to understand, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached by me is not according to man. For neither did I receive it of man, nor did I learn it; but by the revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. i. 11, 12). He protested most strongly against the pagan deification of kings and emperors (1 Cor. viii. 4-6), saying —"There is no God but One . . . One God the Father, and One Lord Jesus Christ." When, therefore, we find him giving to Christ the name and attributes of God, we must interpret him in the sense of Jewish monotheism, and in the light of the Christian revelation.

According to St. Paul Christ is "the only Lord," identical with the Jehovah of the Jews (1 Cor. viii. 6; x. 4-9), "our great God and Savior" (Titus ii. 13), "God exalted above all things" (Rom. ix. 5). He is "God's own, beloved Son" (Rom. viii. 3-32; 2 Cor. i. 19; Eph. i. 6; Col. i. 13), "the Image of the invisible Father" (2 Cor. iv. 4; Col. i. 15), "who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God" (Phil. ii. 6). He is the Creator of all things visible and invisible (Col. i. 16). He is Eternal, "the first born of every creature" (Col. i. 15); Infinite "for in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead corporeally" (Col. ii. 9); Omnipotent, for "all things were created by Him and in Him" (Col. i. 16); Immeasurable, for "He fills all things" (Eph. iv. 10). The tribunal of God is His tribunal, the Gospel of God His Gospel, the Church of God His Church, the Kingdom of God His Kingdom (Rom. xiv. 10; 2 Cor. v. 10; Rom. xvi. 16; Rom. i. 9; 1 Cor. x. 32; Rom. xvi. 16; Eph. v. 5).

St. Paul's testimony is remarkable inasmuch as, before his conversion on the road to Damascus, he deemed it his duty to destroy the work and denounce the name of Jesus, whose divinity he was to proclaim so boldly. He began his public preaching within ten years of the Passion of our Lord, and wrote his first Epistles some twelve years later. "Neither the time which had elapsed, nor his Palestinian associates, nor the circumstances of the death of Jesus were favorable to an apotheosis; and the seriousness of Jewish monotheism did not lend itself to the ridiculous deifications, which placed a Claudius or a Tiberius in the ranks of the immortals" (Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul,* ii., 112).

Bibliography: Arendzen, *Whom Do You Say?;* Chesterton, *The Everlasting Man;* Didon, *Belief in the Divinity of Christ;* Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ;* Lagrange, *The Meaning of Christianity;* Knox, *The Belief of Catholics,* viii., ix.; Lepin, *Christ and the Gospel;* Vassall-Phillips, *The Mustard Tree;* Williamson, *The Book of Life; Lives of Christ,* by Didon, Elliott, Fillion, Fouard, Le Camus, Maas, Meschler. **A. Q. 1876, 100, 475.**

Is there not a fundamental difference between the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of St. John? Is not St. John's Gospel more of a theological treatise than a sober history? Can you prove that St. John really wrote it?

No, there is no fundamental difference between the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of St. John. The only difference lies in the way the portrait of Christ is drawn. As Father Pope says: "In the Synoptic Gospels Christ's miracles and teaching speak for Him; in St. John, Christ speaks for Himself; the few miracles given serve as pegs on which hang Christ's discourses concerning His Nature and Person" (*The Godhead of Christ as Portrayed in the Gospels,* 22).

The differences in style and content are readily understood, once we realize the purpose St. John had in view. While the Synoptists, writing before the fall of Jerusalem, aimed at converting the Jews of the Holy Land and of the dispersion by showing that Jesus was the promised Messias, St. John, writing thirty years after the destruction of the Temple, appealed directly to the pagan world. He desired to correct the false notions current about the *Logos* among Greek thinkers, and to refute the Gnostic and Docetic denials of Christ, the Son of God (John xx. 31). Useless indeed would have been his labors, if he had merely repeated the sayings of St. Matthew, St. Mark and St. Luke.

It would take about one hour to recite slowly all the words of Christ recorded by St. John. The unrecorded sayings of Jesus in public and in private during His three years ministry must have taken many thousands of hours. "Is it not, therefore, a rash and unprovable assertion to maintain that He who said the words in the Synoptics could not also have said what St. John reports?" (Arendzen, *The Gospels,* 65.)

Unbelieving critics lay great stress upon the differences between the Synoptic Gospels and St. John. But they fail to stress the facts they both record. In both, Christ claims to be the Son of God (Mark xiv. 61, 62; John iii. 16-18; v. 18); in both, Christ shows an intimate knowledge of the Father's mind and will (Matt. xi. 25; xii. 50; John viii. 55); in both, Christ claims pre-existence (Luke v. 13; John viii. 23); in both, Christ is the Judge on the Last Day (Matt. x. 32; Mark viii. 38; Luke xvii. 30; John v. 27); in both, Christ is the Lord of the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 8; Mark ii. 28; Luke vi. 5; John v. 17); in both, Christ forgives sin and delegates this power to His Apostles (Matt. ix. 5; xvi. 19; John viii. 11; xx. 23); in both, Christ knows intimately the thoughts of men, and the future (Matt. xxiii. 36; xxvi. 13; John i. 48; ii. 24; vi. 71); in both, Christ demands love and service even unto death (Matt. x. 37-39; xi.

23-30; John xv. 12-21); in both, Christ's disciples are slow to believe in Him (Mark xvi. 14; John vii. 5; xx. 9).

St. John begins his Gospel, not as St. Matthew and St. Luke with Christ's genealogy according to the flesh, but with Christ's Eternal Generation. His sublime Prologue states with marvelous accuracy and clearness the doctrine of the Incarnation. He declares that Christ the Word was from all eternity distinct in Person from the Father, but identical with Him in Nature. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God." Christ is the Creator of the universe, "All things were made by Him." "He is the fullness of Truth and Holiness, and the origin of all intellectual and moral truth." "In Him was Life, and the Life was the Light of men." He was not only true God but True Man, assuming our human nature and making it His very own. "The Word was made Flesh and dwelt among us." John had been an eyewitness of the glory of Christ's divinity on Mount Thabor and after the Resurrection. "We saw His glory, the glory as it were, of the Only-Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth" (John i. 1-14).

The Gospel of St. John is not a theological treatise, but a sober history, detailing every word and deed of Christ which prove His equality with His Father, Jehovah, whom the Jews adored. They stone Him for blasphemy (Lev. xxiv. 16), because He claims to be Lord of the Sabbath, saying "God was His Father and making Himself equal to God" (John v. 18). Again they stone Him, because He, "The Beginning, who had glory with the Father before the world was made" (John viii. 25; xvii. 5), says to them: "Before Abraham was made, I am" (John viii. 53). The idea of God as the Eternal, Self-Existent Being, the "I am who am," was familiar to the Jews (Exod. iii. 14; Ps. lxxxix. 2; Jer. i. 6; Prov. viii. 25). A third time they stone Him, because He asserts His identity of Nature with the Father. "I and the Father are One" (John x. 20). "They called Him a blasphemer, because He made Himself God" (John x. 22, 23; *Cf.* Matt. xxvi. 65; Mark xiv. 64; Luke xxii. 71).

In many another passage Christ claims to be of one Nature with God, His Father. "The Father is in Me, and I in the Father." "If you had known Me, you would without doubt have known My Father also." "He that seeth Me, seeth the Father also." "He who is of God, He hath seen the Father" (John x. 38; xiv. 7, 9; vi. 46). Like God Christ alone claims to be absolutely sinless. "I always do the things that please Him." And he confidently challenges His enemies: "Which of you shall convict Me of sin?" (John viii. 29, 46.)

A careful study of the Fourth Gospel shows that it was written by an eyewitness, a Jew who had personally known

Palestine in the time of Christ, a disciple whom Jesus specially loved (John i. 14; xx. 24; 1 John i. 1). That this disciple was St. John, the Son of Zebedee, who wrote the Fourth Gospel at Ephesus about the year 100, was universally known and undisputed by the end of the second century (Arendzen, *The Gospels,* 52-62; Lagrange, *Evangile selon Saint Jean,* xiii.-lxvi.). Is it reasonable to suppose the whole Christian world was mistaken about so important a fact?

Bibliography: Calmet, *L'Evangile de S. Jean;* Fillion, *Evangile selon Saint Jean;* Fouard, *St. John;* Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ,* i., 35-183; Jacquier, *Histoire des Livres du Nouveau Testament,* iv.; Lebreton, *Histoire du Dogme de la Trinité,* i., 474-540. D. A. i. 1598-1750. —D. B. iii. 1189.

CHRIST'S DERELICTION

Does not Christ's cry of despair on the Cross prove that He was merely a man: "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me" (Matt. xxii. 45; *Cf.* Mark xv. 34)?

By no means. These words of Christ, quoted from the twenty-first Psalm, do not in any way express despair. The Psalmist does not imply that our Lord has lost the favor of God, but that God has abandoned Him to the hatred of His enemies. Christ makes His complaint with a complete trust in God, prays earnestly for deliverance, and ends with joyful words of praise and thanksgiving. If the Psalm is Davidic, it is also evidently Messianic, as we discover by comparing v. 9 with Matt. xxvii. 43; Luke xxxiii. 35; v. 16 with John xix. 28, 29; v. 18 with Matt. xxvii. 36; v. 19 with Matt. xxvii. 35; John xix. 24; v. 23 with Heb. ii. 11, 12). In the first part (vv. 1-22) the prophet speaks of Christ's utter loneliness on the Cross; in the second (vv. 23-32) he speaks of the fulfillment of Christ's prayer: the winning of the nations through His Passion and Death.

The four Gospels clearly show that this false idea of despair is read thoughtlessly or maliciously into the text. Christ is always represented full of confidence in God, rebuking His disciples for their lack of faith (Matt. xxvi. 53; Mark iv. 40; Luke viii. 25); the night before He died He had told them "to have confidence, I have overcome the world" (John xvi. 33). On the Cross He had promised Paradise to the penitent thief (Luke xxiii. 43), and He had lovingly committed His soul to His heavenly Father (Luke xxiii. 46). He had freely accepted the chalice His Father gave Him to drink (Luke xxii. 42). "He was offered because it was His own will" (Isa. liii. 7).

Some well-meaning but unscholarly preachers of the Gospel

have suggested that Christ allowed Himself to experience the torments of hell, as if He were alienated for a time from His Father. Such a view is utterly alien to Catholic teaching. Our Savior, it is true, endured on the Cross a mental agony in contemplating the sins of men which far exceeded His physical sufferings, but He knew that He was God's beloved Son, and He always enjoyed to the full the vision of His heavenly Father. The guilt of actual sin cannot be transferred from one soul to another. To assert that the guilt of men's sins were transferred to our Lord dying on the Cross is absurd and blasphemous.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bird, *A Commentary on the Psalms,* 194-208; Boylan, *The Psalms,* 78-83.

Did not Christ, in refusing the title "good," and ascribing goodness to God alone, by this very fact disclaim divinity? "Why callest thou Me good? There is none good but one, that is God" (Matt. xix. 17; *Cf.* Mark x. 18; Luke xviii. 19).

No, Christ in His answer to the rich young man of the Gospel, neither disclaimed His goodness, nor His divinity. Such questions did not arise either in His mind, or in the mind of His questioner. His words were in no sense a rebuke. He merely wished the young man to realize that God, the Author of the Commandments of Sinai, was the One Infinite Good. The text that St. Justin had before him makes this clear: "He alone is good, My Father who is in heaven" (*Dial.*, xvi., 7).

Besides when the young man assured our Lord that he had kept the Commandments from his youth, Christ advised him, if he wished to be perfect: "Sell all thou hast, and follow Me." This is a clear statement that following Christ in absolute poverty is a higher service than keeping the Commandments. If Christ were not God, such an exacting demand would be blasphemous.

THE TEMPTATION

If Christ were really divine how could He undergo temptation? Is not the account of Christ's temptation legendary, or at least a parable He taught to teach His followers how to meet the trials of life (Matt. iv. 1-11; Mark i. 12, 13; Luke iv. 1-13)?

Jesus Christ, the absolutely Holy and Sinless Son of God (John viii. 29; 46; Heb. vii. 26), could never experience, as we

do, the inward strife of the flesh and the spirit, or the trials that come from errors of the reason or from weakness of the will. But He was True Man, and, therefore, was really tempted externally by the devil. "For in that, wherein He Himself hath suffered and been tempted, He is able to succor them that are tempted." "For we have not a High Priest, who cannot have compassion on our infirmities; but One tempted in all things like as we are, without sin" (Heb. i. 18; iv. 15).

The formal, detailed and concordant testimony of St. Matthew and St. Luke forbids any fair-minded reader denying the truth of a narrative, which must have come from our Lord Himself, probably at the Last Supper (John xvi. 33).

Catholics are free either to accept the details literally with Father Lagrange, or figuratively with Bishop Le Camus of La Rochelle. The latter writes: "It would be simpler, perhaps, to concede that the Gospel story relates to us, in metaphors, the threefold interior combat which Jesus sustained against Satan, and from which He came forth completely victorious. . . . All these details plainly cause this story to hover between the material, external reality which is rather difficult to admit, and the psychological internal reality, which amply explains the important moral lesson of Jesus. It was in imagination that Satan placed Christ on the pinnacle of the Temple and on the mountain, and it was before His mind only that he called up the kingdoms of the earth. No more was needed to try Jesus. Physical reality would add nothing to the temptation."

Bibliography: Didon, *The Life of Christ*, i., 152-173; Felder, *Christ and the Critics*, ii., 53-57; Le Camus, *The Life of Christ*, i., 266, 267; Lagrange, *Evangile selon S. Matthieu and S. Luc*, 58-66, 127-136. I. T. Jan., 1914.

THE REDEMPTION

Does not the Atonement mean that Christ by His preaching and His example delivered men from sin?

It does not. This view can be held only by those who deny the divinity of Christ. Our Lord, indeed, did a great work for mankind by His preaching and example, but the Catholic doctrine of the Atonement means something altogether different.

Christ merited our salvation by His death upon the Cross, willingly, freely and humbly accepted in obedience to the will of His heavenly Father, and out of love for us (Phil. ii. 6-9; 1 Cor. xv. 3; Gal. i. 4; i. 20; Eph. v. 25). He took upon Himself the debt of our sins, and made satisfaction for them to God (2 Cor. v. 21; Gal. iii. 13). He redeemed us. purchasing our

freedom from the captivity of sin, and repurchasing for us the liberty of the children of God (Heb. ix. 15; 1 Titus ii. 6; ii. 14; Gal. iv. 31; v. 13).

The Catholic doctrine of the Redemption is defined briefly by the Council of Ephesus (Anath. x.) in 431 and by the Eleventh Council of Toledo in 675, which speaks of "the Sacrifice of Christ as a sin offering." Pope Eugenius IV in 1441 (Decretum pro Jacobitis) declares that "the merit of the Mediator, Jesus Christ, God and Man, cancelled sin and opened heaven." The Council of Trent defined that "by the merit of the One Mediator, our Lord Jesus Christ, Original Sin is taken away" (Sess. v., can. 3); and that "the meriting cause of our justification is our Lord Jesus Christ, who made satisfaction for us on the Cross to God the Father" (Sess. vi., ch. 7; Denzinger, *Enchiridion,* nos. 123, 286, 711, 790, 799).

The doctrine of the Redemption is clearly taught in the Gospels, and especially in the writings of St. Paul. At the very beginning of St. Matthew, we learn that the name of Jesus is symbolic of His mission of Redemption—"for He shall save His people from their sins" (Matt. i. 21). Christ Himself certainly foresaw His death, and accepted it as an essential part of His divine mission (Matt. xvi. 21; xvii. 21; xx. 17; xx. 22; Mark viii. 31; ix. 11, 30; xiv. 34; Luke ix. 22, 44; xii. 32; xvii. 25). More than once He tells us that His death will avail for the salvation of mankind: "The Son of Man is come to give His life a Redemption for many" (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45); "This is My Blood of the New Testament which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins" (Matt. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 24; xxii. 20).

In St. John's Gospel Christ sums up in a few words the whole mystery of salvation. "God so loved the world as to give His Only Begotten Son" (John iii. 16). His life of suffering and death is gladly accepted as a commandment from His Father (John xiv. 31). He is troubled at the thought of death (John xii. 27), but freely accepts it out of love for us (John x. 17; xiv. 31; xviii. 11). The Good Shepherd dies that His sheep might live (John x. 10-15), and promises that on the Cross "He will draw all men to Himself" (John xii. 32).

Christ Himself was the first to connect our salvation with His own death, and the whole mystery of the Redemption lies in the fact that He willed to give His life for us and for our sins. St. Paul explains the doctrine more in detail, by using the ideas of ransom (Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14; *Cf.* 1 Peter i. 1, 2, 18, 19; Apoc. v. 4), sacrifice (Eph. v. 2; Heb. ix. 14-26; x. 10), reconciliation (Col. i. 20; Eph. ii. 13-15; Rom. v. 10), and vicarious satisfaction (2 Cor. v. 21; Gal. iii. 13). "In whom we have Redemption through His blood"; "As God has loved us and hath delivered

Himself for us"; "how much more shall the Blood of Christ, who by the Holy Ghost offered Himself unspotted unto God, cleanse our conscience from dead works"; "we are sanctified by the oblation of the Body of Jesus Christ once"; "through Him to reconcile all things unto Himself, making peace through the Blood of His Cross"; "now in Christ Jesus, you, who some time were afar off, are made nigh by the Blood of Christ"; "when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son"; "Him, who knew no sin, He hath made sin for us," *i. e.*, treated Him as bearing our sin; "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us"; *i. e.*, Christ took upon Himself the outward curse of the Jewish Law, or crucifixion (Deut. xxi. 22, 23), to deliver us from the real curse of sin.

"You are bought with a great price," says St. Paul, and that great price is Christ Himself, "who gave Himself a Redemption for all" (1 Tim. ii. 6). The Sacrifice of Christ was efficacious, for it redeemed us from the bondage of sin (Rom. vi. 16, 17; vii 4. *Cf.* John viii. 34), of Satan (Col. ii. 15; 2 Tim. ii. 26), and of death (1 Cor. xv. 24-27; 2 Tim. i. 10).

Christ's Redemption, however, did not at once blot out every sin: it merely provided the means whereby the remission of sin was made possible. To share in His Redemption, to "draw nigh to Christ" (Heb. vii. 19), to be incorporated into His Mystical Body, the Church, we must believe with a faith that works by charity (Rom. iii. 25; Col. i. 23; 1 Cor. xiii. 13), and receive the Sacraments divinely instituted by Christ for the remission of sins. For Christ Himself said: "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God" (John iii. 5). And if we lose God's grace by grievous sin, we must be pardoned by the divine ministry that He established (John xx. 21-23). Christ's death indeed is the source of all virtues,—confidence in His goodness (Rom. viii. 32), the spirit of sacrifice (Col. i. 24), the love of God and the brethren (Rom. v. 8; 2 Cor. v. 14; Gal. ii. 20; Phil. ii. 4, 5; Eph. iv. 32).

As Father Prat says: "The drama of Calvary speaks an eloquent language to every noble heart; if Christ dies for us, who were nothing to Him, how much more ought we to live for Him, who is everything to us; and if Christ gave His life for strangers, how much more ought we to give ours for our brethren? Jesus, in giving Himself up for us wished His example of self-abnegation not to be lost; thereby He counted on triumphing over our selfishness, and this is one of the considerations which the Apostle emphasizes by saying that the love of Christ constrains him and leaves him no rest (2 Cor. v. 14, 15). . . . That the redeeming death of Christ is valuable to us as an example a lesson, and an encouragement is, therefore, perfectly

clear. The great mistake of Abelard (and of modern rationalists who deny the divinity of Christ), was to believe it was only that: a manifestation of love, designed to produce in us a responsive love" (*The Theology of St. Paul,* ii., 189).

Bibliography: Hallett, *The Atonement;* Lattey (ed.), *The Atonement;* Oxenham, *The Atonement;* Pohle, *Soteriology;* Rivière, *The Doctrine of the Atonement;* Wilhelm-Scannell, *A Manual of Catholic Theology,* ii., 181, 207. C. W. iv. 652; xcviii. 772; cx. 721; cxi. 295.—E. Nov., 1905,

Was it just for God to punish His innocent Son for the sins of men?

As we have seen (p. 58) this is not the teaching of the Catholic Church. God did not look upon His Son as a sinner or as His foe, as Bossuet and Bourdaloue falsely stated, for Christ was "Holy, Innocent, Undefiled (Heb. vii. 26), and therefore had not to suffer for Himself; He suffered for us alone, taking upon Himself the penalty due our sins." In the economy of salvation the sinner is bound to give personal satisfaction; if he does not, his lot is damnation. Christ was not punished instead of the sinner, nor against His own will as sinners are punished; by the holiest of free acts (Rom. v. 6-9) He bore the penalties of sin in order to merit for the sinner a means of satisfying which lay beyond human power. His vicarious satisfaction is not the transfer of punishment from the unjust to the just, but the transfer of the merits of the just to the unjust.

Bibliography: Rivière, *The Atonement,* i., 6, 13; Wilhelm-Scannell, *A Manual of Catholic Theology,* ii., 188.

THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

How can anyone know with certainty what books are contained in the Bible? Why do Catholics include the Apocrypha on their list of Biblical books? Why does your Church's list contain more books than the Protestant Bible?

The Council of Trent in 1546 (Sess. iv.) declared that all the books of the Old and New Testament contained in the Catholic Bible were sacred (inspired) and canonical. While, therefore, non-Catholic Christians are dependent upon the fallible witness of critical arguments for their canon, Catholics depend upon the divine witness of an infallible teaching Church.

The canon solemnly defined by the Council of Trent is identical with the lists of sacred books promulgated by the Councils

of Florence (1441), Carthage (397), Hippo (393), Laodicea (363), and by Popes Innocent (401), Hormisdas (514-523), Gelasius (492-496) and Pope Damasus (366-384).

The deutero-canonical books, called by Protestants apocrypha, were included in these lists. They are Tobias, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch and the two Books of Machabees, together with fragments of Esther (x. 4; xvi. 24), and Daniel (iii. 24-90; xiii.; xiv.). These books were contained in the Alexandrian Canon, which was used by the Greek-speaking Jews of Alexandria, Asia Minor, Greece and Italy. The Palestinian Canon, used by the Semitic-speaking Jews of Palestine, Syria and Mesopotamia, omitted these books in the first centuries after Christ, although probably it originally contained them.

Christ Himself never expressly cited the deutero-canonical books, but, of the three hundred and fifty quotations from the Old Testament, three hundred are taken directly from the Greek Septuagint. Father Pope mentions eighteen passages, citing Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus and Judith (*Aids to the Bible,* i., 54). The Christians of early Rome must have known them, for the frescoes of the Catacombs picture Susanna and the elders, as well as Moses and Jonas (Northcote-Brownlow, *Roma Sotterranea,* 172). The writers of the first three centuries in both East and West often quote or allude to them: St. Clement of Rome, The Shepherd of Hermas, St. Irenæus, St. Hippolytus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Polycarp, Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Dionysius of Alexandria.

While many of the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, influenced greatly by St. Jerome, denied the canonicity of the deutero-canonical books, in practice they quoted them both for instruction in doctrine and for guidance in conduct. For the Bible they used was the Greek Bible, which had been handed down to them by their predecessors, and which contained all the books we have to-day (Gigot, *General Introduction to the Bible,* 53). The Popes of the day—Damasus, Innocent and Gelasius—taught the same canon as the Fathers of the Council of Trent.

The term apocryphal with us means writings falsely attributed to the Prophets of the Old Law or the Apostles of the New, whose claim to inspiration was rejected, or at least ignored by the Church. Such for example were the Book of Enoch, the Assumption of Moses, the proto-Evangel of St. James, the Acts of St. Peter and St. Paul, the Letter of Christ to Abgar, etc.

Bibliography: Grannan, *General Introduction to the Bible,* iii., 145-230. D. Oct., 1893.—D. A. i. 435, 455.—D. B. ii. 134, 184.—D. T. ii. 1550, 1605.

INSPIRATION

What do Catholics mean when they say the Bible is inspired? Are not all the works of literary geniuses inspired? Do you believe that every word of the Bible is dictated by God?

The true meaning of the inspiration of the Bible is that God is the Author of all the seventy-three books of the Old and New Testament. The Vatican Council (Sess. iii.), after declaring that God's revelation to man is contained in the Bible and tradition, and that the canon or list of the Sacred Scriptures is complete in the authentic Latin Vulgate translation, plainly teaches the Catholic doctrine of inspiration. It says: "The Church holds these books as sacred and canonical, not because, composed by merely human industry, they were thereupon approved by her authority; nor alone because they contain revelation without error; but because, written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they HAVE GOD FOR THEIR AUTHOR, and as such were delivered to the Church herself."

Mere approval of a book by the Church, absolute inerrancy in its content, or the fact that it contains revelation, do not make that book inspired. It must have God for its Author.

Pope Leo. XIII thus explains this divine authorship in his Encyclical on the Bible, *Providentissimus Deus*. He writes: "God by His supernatural power in such a way incited and moved them (the sacred writers) to write, in such a way assisted them in writing, that they should rightly conceive in the mind, and should wish to write faithfully, and should express fitly with infallible truth, all those things and only those things which He Himself should order; otherwise He would not Himself be the Author of all Sacred Scripture."

The inspired writers are not mere passive instruments in their writings, but under the divine action are intelligent, active and free agents.

They need not know the fact of their inspiration, nor do they need in every instance a direct revelation from God. We know that the author of the Second Book of Machabees abridged the five books of Jason of Cyrene (2 Mac. ii. 27), and that St. Luke consulted documents and gathered his facts from "eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word" (i. 1, 2). Their literary style and wording may be their own (2 Mac. xv. 39, 40), so that we often find verbal differences among them (Matt. v. 3; Luke vi. 29; Matt. xxvi. 26; Luke xxii. 19; Mark xiv. 22; 1 Cor. xi. 23). God may inspire the very words they use, but this is not essential to the motion of inspiration. We may hold, for ex-

ample, that Moses is the author of the Pentateuch, but we are not bound to believe, as the Biblical Commission tells us, that Moses wrote or dictated everything himself. Writing under divine inspiration himself, he may have "committed it to one or more to write, yet in such a way that they should faithfully express his meaning, write nothing or omit nothing against his will, and that the work . . . approved by Moses, the chief inspired author, should be published in his name."

Bibliography: Brucker, *Questions Actuelles de l'Ecriture Sainte;* Calmet, *Qu'est-Ce que l'Ecriture Sainte?;* Chauvin, *L'Inspiration des Divines Ecritures;* Fonck, *Der Kampf um die Wahrheit der Heil. Schrift;* Gigot, *General Introduction to the Bible,* 542, 559; Grannan, *General Introduction to the Bible,* iii., 3-140; Holzhey, *Die Inspiration der Heil. Schrift;* Lattey (ed.), *The Religion of the Scriptures;* Lagrange, *Historical Criticism of the Old Testament,* Lect. iii.; Pope, *The Church and the Bible; Catholic Student's Aids to the Bible,* i., 40-45; *The Bible, Its History and Authenticity.* C. E. viii. 45-50.—C. W. xl. 1; lvi. 742; lvii. 206.—D. July, 1921.—D. T. vii. 2168-2266.—I. T. April, 1907; July, 1911.—R. B. 1895, 563; 1896, 199-496.—R. C. xxxvi. 104; xxxviii. 331.—T. Nov. 6, 1877; Feb. 5, 1898.

THE CRITERION OF INSPIRATION

How can one be absolutely sure what books constitute the content of the inspired Bible?

The criterion or test that will enable us to make an act of divine faith in the inspired Bible must be infallibly true, universally applicable, and universally adapted to the minds of all men. "As the inspiration of the sacred books," writes Father Gigot, "is a divine operation, not necessarily known even to the mind that is acted upon by the Holy Spirit, it necessarily follows that the testimony of God Himself is required to make men perfectly sure of its existence; but this divine testimony comes to their knowledge, and is the absolute ground of their faith, only by the voice of that infallible and living Church, which He has commanded us to hear" (*Biblical Lectures,* 368).

Catholics believe that the divine testimony regarding the inspiration of the Bible was revealed by God to the Church in the days of the Apostles; that it has been preserved always from error by the promises of Christ; that it has been handed down to us, not merely by human tradition, but by the divine tradition of the Catholic Church, which alone can infallibly interpret it.

PROTESTANT CRITERIA OF INSPIRATION

Does not the content and the literary form of the Bible prove its inspiration? Does not the Bible contain miracles and prophecies, holy and sublime doctrines, and appeal to the heart of man by its peculiar beauty and simplicity?

No, the book itself does not guarantee its own inspiration. Such a criterion is useless, because at most it would prove that some parts of some books are inspired, but not that any book is divine in its origin. The writings of many of the Fathers and saints of the Church contain topics just as sublime, and written in just as sublime and simple a style. And yet no one ever considered St. Augustine, St. Bernard or Thomas à Kempis inspired. Some books like Numbers are in many portions as interesting as the multiplication table, while others like Esther do not mention any religious topic whatsoever. Literary taste, moreover, is variable and subjective, and, therefore, useless as a test of inspiration.

Can we not prove the inspiration of the Bible from "the inward testimony of the Spirit?" Does not the Bible produce in the reader sentiments of devotion, faith, hope, and love of God and one's neighbor?

No, this criterion is no criterion whatever, as Dr. Eck told Luther at the Leipzig Disputation, when he argued that the inspired and canonical character of the books of the Bible could be known only by the divine authority and tradition of the Catholic Church. He quoted St. Augustine against him: "I am compelled to believe the Gospel only on the authority of the Catholic Church" (*Contra Epis. Fund. Manich.*, ch. 5).

Such a criterion is purely subjective. The impression received from reading the Bible varies with each individual reader, and as happened in Luther's case, may give rise to arbitrary denials of whole books of the Bible. For example, he eliminated the Second Book of Machabees because he rejected the doctrine of purgatory; he considered the Apocalypse "neither apostolic nor prophetic"; he called the Epistle of St. James an "Epistle of straw," and declared the Apostle was "mad with his crazy doctrine of good works" (Grisar, *Luther*, v., 521, 522).

Moreover, there are many portions of the Bible which do not arouse devotion, and many non-inspired books that do. On this false test we would have to reject the inspiration of Exodus xxxv., Leviticus xi., or 2 Kings xi. and maintain the inspiration of the *Interior Castle* of St. Teresa and the *Dark Night of the Soul* of St. John of the Cross.

Does not the Apostolic origin of a book of the Bible prove that it is inspired? Can we not rightfully appeal to the teaching of the primitive Church?

The Apostolic office implies doctrinal infallibility, but not necessarily the positive divine assistance in the act of writing, which constitutes inspiration. Even if we admit with some Catholic writers like Lamy, Ubaldi and Schanz, that Christ actually gave the Apostles the gift of inspiration, this criterion would not be helpful, because the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke, together with the Acts of the Apostles, were not written by an Apostle.

Some non-Catholics have realized this, and have, therefore, appealed to the testimony of the primitive Church. In this they are inconsistent, as true Protestantism rejects all ecclesiastical tradition. And in denying the inspiration of the deutero-canonical books, they at the same time reject the witness of this very primitive Church, which knew the Old Testament only in its Greek form, the Septuagint.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Gigot, *General Introduction to the Bible,* 518-540; Grannan, *General Introduction to the Bible,* iii., 8-22.

INERRANCY

Do Catholics regard the Bible as absolutely inerrant? Is not the Bible incorrect on scientific matters? Are there not many errors and contradictions to be found in the text of both the Old and New Testaments?

Yes, it is an article of faith that the Bible is inerrant, *i. e.,* it contains no formal error. As God is the Author of the Bible it must needs be true. "Inspiration," says Pope Leo, "not only is essentially incompatible with error, but excludes and rejects it as absolutely and necessarily, for it is impossible that God, the Supreme Truth, can utter that which is not true. This is the ancient and unchanging faith of the Church" (Encyc. *Providentissimus Deus*).

1. We cannot restrict inspiration to certain parts only of the Bible, as Cardinal Newman held in his theory about the unimportance of "obiter dicta" (*XIX Century,* February, 1884).

2. We cannot restrict inspiration to faith and morals alone.

3. We do not look for precise scientific formulas in the Bible, for it does not teach science *ex professo.* Nothing in its pages contradicts the teachings of natural science. because the same God is the author of natural and supernatural truth. But the

sacred writers generally speak of scientific matters in more or less figurative language, or in terms which were commonly used at the time they wrote.

4. May Catholics hold the theory of "implicit quotations," *i. e.*, may they set aside a certain passage on the supposition that the sacred writer is merely copying what he finds in some historical record, without thereby guaranteeing its veracity? Yes, says the Biblical Commission (February 13, 1905), if solid reasons exist for believing that there really is a quotation, and that the sacred writer does not really intend to commit himself to what he quotes.

5. We must remember that the Bible on its material side is a human document handed down to us in a human way. Therefore we naturally expect to find in each succeeding copy or version material variations, additions, omissions and other errors with which critical scholarship has to grapple. St. Augustine mentions this in a letter to St. Jerome: "When in the pages of Sacred Writ I come upon anything that is contrary to the truth, I judge that the text is faulty, that the translator did not strike the right meaning, or simply that I do not understand it" (*Letter to St. Jerome,* lxxxii., 3).

6. The poetic imagery and symbolism in both the Old and New Testament, in the Prophets, the Psalms, the Apocalypse, is to be understood figuratively. But "this exuberant symbolism must not be conceived as supplanting reality, but as supporting it, as bringing out its full reality, not so much to our prosaic selves, as to the Orientals for whom so much of it was primarily written" (*The Bible, Its History,* 159).

Bibliography: De Broglie, *Questions Bibliques;* Brucker, *Questions Actuelles d'Ecriture Sainte;* Lagrange, *Historical Criticism.* D. A. ii. 752-787.—R. C. xxxi. 550; xlv. 148.

THE LATIN VULGATE

How could the Council of Trent (1546) declare the Vulgate "authentic," when we know it contains many mistakes? Why did it so ignorantly set aside the Hebrew and Greek Bibles? Did not Clement VII's corrections of the Sixtine Bible prove that Sixtus V was not infallible?

The original Scriptures were not even mentioned in the disciplinary decree, *Insuper,* of the Council of Trent, and the Fathers expressly stated that "it was not meant to detract from

the authority due to the true and pure translation of the Septuagint." The authenticity of the Hebrew and Greek Bibles remained exactly the same as it was before, and Catholic scholars were allowed perfect liberty to use them to arrive at the genuine meaning of the Latin version.

In declaring the Vulgate "authentic," *i. e.*, officially guaranteed, the Council did not imply that it was in every respect an absolutely accurate rendering of the original text, but that it was free from error in faith and morals, and was substantially faithful to the original Scriptures. Henceforth it was to be the Church's official text in all "public conferences, disputations, sermons, and expositions." The Decree referred to the Vulgate as it left the hands of St. Jerome, and the bishops, fully aware of the many faulty current copies, ordered a revision of the text to be made. The first revision was completed by Sixtus V in 1590 (Baumgarten, *Die Vulgata Sixtina von 1590*), to be corrected again by Clement VIII in 1592 (Le Bachelet, *Bellarmine et la Bible Sixto-Clementine*). Despite Dr. Salmon (*The Infallibility of the Church,* 227) infallibility is not in question, for the many trifling differences between the two revisions are mere matters of scholarship. "The Church has never taught that the authenticity of the Vulgate implied such verbal accuracy in its text as would exclude all future emendation" (Brodrick, *Blessed Robert Bellarmine,* 288-297). Pius X in 1907 appointed a committee of Benedictines under Abbot Gasquet to study every known manuscript in order to determine as accurately as possible the original text of St. Jerome. Three books, Genesis, Exodus and Leviticus, have thus far been published.

Bibliography: Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate;* Cavellera, *St. Jerome;* Quentin, *Mémoire sur l'Etablissement du texte de la Vulgate; Concilium Tridentinum,* i., 5; *The Bible, Its History and Authenticity,* 100-129. C. E. xv. 515-520.—C. W. cxxix. 422.—D. Oct., 1908.—D. A. iv. 1943-1980.—D. B. v. 2465-2500.—D. T. ii. 1599.—E. T. li. 35, 206; lxiii. 589; cxxxiii. 596; cxxxiv. 244.—*The Forum,* Oct., 1908.

THE SIX DAYS

Is the history of creation in the first chapters of Genesis scientific history? Are Catholics bound to believe that the world was created in six days of twenty-four hours each?

No, we answer to both questions. A careful examination of the account of creation in Genesis shows that it is given in a more or less poetical form, expressed in popular not scientific

language. Although descriptive of a definite series of operations, it teaches us nothing but the fact that God created all things and rested upon the Sabbath day. As the Church has never made any definite pronouncement regarding the various theories held by Catholic scholars, Catholics are perfectly free to adopt any theory that does not deny the historical character of the first three chapters of Genesis. (Pope, *Aids to the Bible,* 180, 192; *Decision of the Biblical Commission,* June 30, 1909). While, as St. Thomas says, "it is part of the substance of the faith that the world began by creation . . . in what manner and order it was made . . . our holy men have expounded in many ways" (*In* II. Sent., xii., 9, art. 11).

The Literal view, commonly held by the Fathers and the Schoolmen, interprets the six days as literal days of twenty-four hours each. This general consensus has no binding dogmatic force, because it has against it the authority of St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas.

The Concordist theory regards the six days as indefinite periods of time, and aims to reconcile Genesis with the data of science by way of concordance. Although this view has had many supporters (Vigouroux, *Manuel Biblique,* i., 493-533), it is rejected by many Catholic scholars, because it is not founded upon the analogy of faith, and tends to make religion subordinate to the ever varying and contradictory hypotheses of science. Is it honest to read into a popular account the scientific opinions of centuries to come? (Barry, *The Tradition of Scripture,* 242-245; Dordolot, *Darwinism and Catholic Thought,* 33-42.)

The Poetic theory declares that the first chapter of Genesis was probably nothing more than a ritual hymn, consecrating each day of the week to a particular creative act of God (Bishop Clifford, *D.,* 1881, i., 311; ii., 498).

The Vision theory maintains that God showed Adam in a series of visions the general dependence of everything upon His creative power (Hummelauer, *Comm. in Genesim;* Scheeben, *Handbuch der Kath. Dogmatik*).

The Allegory theory of St. Augustine (*De Gen. contra Man.,* ii., 2) holds that the only answer to every difficulty is to see in Genesis the history of the origin of the world and of man described in metaphorical form—a view that does not weaken the historical character of the narrative, but assumes it (Pope, *Aids to the Bible,* 199).

St. Augustine gives his readers some very sensible words of advice, when discussing this very question. He writes: "In things that are obscure and remote from sight, if we read anything even in Scripture which, with safety to our faith, can bear different meanings, let us not by precipitate assertion so throw ourselves into any one interpretation, as to be ruined in case

a fuller investigation of the truth should overthrow our view. This would be to fight, not for the meaning of Holy Scripture, but for our own meaning" (*De Gen ad Lit.*, i., 37).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Pope, *Aids to the Bible*, i., 192. C. E. vii. 313.—D. April, July, 1881; April, 1883.—I. T. Oct., 1909.

CAIN'S WIFE

Did not Cain marry a Pre-Adamite woman (Gen. iv. 17)? Can a Catholic believe in the Pre-Adamites?

No, for it is an article of faith that all men now living are descended from one pair of progenitors, Adam and Eve (Father Pesch, *De Deo Creante*, 154). The unity of the race is proved from the Scriptures, which declare that all men are descended from one couple (Gen. i. 26-28). Eve is called "the mother of all the living" (Gen. iii. 20), and Adam is called "the father of the world, who was created alone" (Wisd. x. 1; *Cf.* Gen. ii. 5, 20). St. Paul proved to the Greeks at Athens the unity of God from the unity of the human race: "God hath made of one (man) all mankind to dwell upon the whole face of the earth" (Acts xvii. 26; *Cf.* Jacquier, *Les Actes des Apôtres*, 532). In the supernatural order St. Paul teaches the unity of the race by the doctrine of Original Sin. "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into this world, and by sin death; and so death passed upon all men, in whom all have sinned" (Rom. v. 12).

That all men spring from a common stock is proved from history, which declares Asia the cradle of the human race; from philology, which traces all languages back to a common primitive tongue, from physiology, which proves that all races have the same anatomical structure, variations of color, cranial formation, etc., being non-essential differences; from national psychology, which shows the intellectual unity of all peoples.

The Biblical arguments for the existence of the Pre-Adamites brought forward by the Calvinist de la Peyrère in 1655 at Bordeaux in France, proved nothing, and were finally abandoned by their author, who eventually became a Catholic and a member of the Oratory.

Cain most probably married his sister. "As there were no human beings," says St. Augustine, "except those who had been born of Adam and Eve (Gen. v. 4), men married their sisters; an act which was as certainly dictated by necessity in those ancient days, as afterwards it was condemned by the prohibitions of religion" (*The City of God*, xv., 16). Some actions are

intrinsically and always bad, as perjury or the hatred of God; other bad actions may become lawful in certain circumstances, as taking what belongs to another in case of necessity, or marrying one's sister in the beginning, when no other woman was available as wife.

Bibliography: Devivier-Sasia, *Christian Apologetics*, i., 303-310; Guibert, *Whence and How of the Universe;* Hettinger, *Natural Religion*, iv.; Vigouroux, *Manuel Biblique*, i., 585-599.

THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN

Does not modern science plainly show the falsity of the Bible's chronology with regard to the age of the human race?

It does not, because it has not yet solved the problem of the antiquity of man, and probably never will. Besides the Bible makes no pretence of giving us a scientific chronology. Father Pope well says: "It is well to bear in mind that the Biblical chronological system is in no sense a scientific one, that its details are often conflicting, that starting as it does from the beginning when there can have been no means of dating events—it is possibly only meant as a guide to the memory, and not as a clue to history. On the other hand none of the dates assigned by scholars to the events of this early period can be regarded as more than approximate, and should not be regarded as solid means of testing the Biblical statements" (*The Catholic Student's Aids to the Bible*, i., 21).

Take for example the period from the Creation to the Flood: the Hebrew Bible reckons 1,656 years, the Septuagint 2,242, and the Samaritan 1,307. These variants do not arise, as some used to think, from the mistakes of copyists or translators, but plainly indicate different systems of chronology. The Church has never interfered with the freedom of scientists in determining the age of the race from the data of prehistory, geology or anthropology. In the name of common sense, however, she asks scientists not to give forth their guesses as absolute truths. If the Abbé Breuil, one of the most eminent modern anthropologists, asserts that man has lived upon this earth about 20,000 years, and Sir Arthur Keith, another eminent anthropologist, pleads for 350,000; if some scientists reckon the duration of the post-glacial epoch at five thousand years (Wright) and others at 20,000 (Penck); if some geologists require 7,000 years for the Niagara River to erode the whole gorge (Wright), while others require

20,000 (Coleman), you cannot blame the outsider from being utterly skeptical about these varying figures.

There is little doubt that the monuments recently discovered in Egypt and Chaldea show a fairly advanced stage of civilization from 4000 to 5000 B. C., so that we must antedate by some years the Biblical chronology of the Hebrew or Greek Old Testament. But we see no reason whatever for placing the antiquity of man beyond 10,000 (Guibert) or 20,000 years (Brueil).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Boulay, *L'ancienneté de l'homme;* Guibert, *Whence and How of the Universe;* Hamard, *L'Homme Tertiare;* Zahm, *The Bible, Science and Faith.* A. Q. 1893, 225, 502, 719; 1894, 260.—D. A. ii. 462-492.—C. W. xl. 635.

THE DELUGE

Is not the story of the deluge a legend or a nature myth? Does not modern science prove that it was not universal?

No, the deluge is an historical fact attested by every Catholic writer from the very beginning of Christianity. The New Testament frequently mentions it. Christ speaks of it as being no less real than His second coming (Matt. xxiv. 37-39; *Cf.* Luke xvii. 26, 27). The Epistle to the Hebrews refers to Noe's "framing of the ark for the saving of his house" (xi. 7). St. Peter twice refers to the flood as an historical fact (1 Peter iii. 20; 2 Peter ii. 5; *Cf.* Isa. liv. 9; Ecclus. xliv. 18). The tradition of the deluge is the most universal tradition in the history of primitive man. We find it among the Chaldeans, Phoenicians, Syrians, Armenians, Hindus, Persians, Chinese, Mexicans, etc. Andrée enumerates eighty-eight flood stories among the ancients, and considers sixty-two of them independent of the Hebrew and Chaldaic tradition (*Die Flutsagen Ethnographisch Betrachtet*).

Catholics to-day do not believe in the geographical universality of the deluge, although they believe that it destroyed the whole human race, except Noe and his family (Gen. vii. 1; 1 Peter iii. 20).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Motais, *Le Déluge Mosaique;* Vigouroux, *Manuel Biblique,* i., 623-654. C. E. iv. 702.—C. G. Nov., 1925.—C. W. xliv. 741; xliv. 17; l. 640.—R. C. xv. 471.—D. A. ii. 917.—D. B. ii. 1355.—E. Jan., 1893.

THE MIRACLE OF JOSUE

How can you explain the so-called miracle of Josue in commanding the sun to stand still (Josue x. 12)? Was not Galileo unjustly condemned by your Church, because he would not interpret this passage of the Bible literally?

The Bible is not a scientific treatise of astronomy, for as Pope Leo XIII says: "The sacred writers did not seek to penetrate the secrets of nature, but rather described and dealt with things in more or less figurative language, or in terms which were commonly used at the time, and which in many instances are in daily use at this day, even by the most eminent men of science" (*Providentissimus Deus*). In giving a literal interpretation to Josue x. 12, the scientists and theologians of the seventeenth century forgot this important fact, and tried to make the Bible conform to the current Ptolemaic theory.

We readily grant that the Congregations of the Index and the Inquisition made a mistake in condemning the Copernican theory, but their decrees were disciplinary in scope, and in no sense infallible. Cardinal Bellarmine wrote to Father Foscarini, April 12, 1615: "I wish to say that, if ever the Copernican theory be really demonstrated, we must then be more careful in explaining those passages of the Scriptures which appear contrary thereunto. We must say then that we do not understand their meaning, rather than declare a thing false which has been proved to be true." Bishop Caramuel, writing in 1651, says: "What would happen if scholars were one day to demonstrate the truth of the Copernican theory?" And he answers: "In that case the Cardinals would allow us to interpret the words of Josue x. as metaphorical expressions" (*Theol. Moral. Fund.*, i., 273).

To-day when the Copernican theory is everywhere accepted, we are free to reject the literal interpretation of Josue x. 12. We mention briefly two theories held by eminent Jesuit theologians. Father Hummelauer (*Comm. in Josue*) maintains that whilst the Amorrhites were fleeing from the children of Israel, the clouds, containing the death-dealing hailstones (x. 11), covered the whole sky, hiding the sun and moon in absolute darkness. Josue, full of confidence in God, ordered the sun and moon to reappear (x. 12), which command was instantly obeyed (x. 13). His address to the sun and moon: "Move not, O sun, towards Gabaon, nor thou, O moon, towards the valley of Ajalon" were really only a bold metaphor, for he poetically looked upon the sun and moon as hurrying on in their course, as if they wished to make the day shorter. His words of command imply

a reappearance of the sun and moon, and not a stopping of these heavenly bodies. Father Hummelauer cites Ecclesiasticus xlvi. 5, "and one day made as two," as a confirmation of his view. The day at Gabaon seemed equal to two days, because the reappearance of the sun after the great darkness gave the Jewish soldiers a change from darkness to light twice in one day.

Father Beurlier (*R. C.*, xxxix., 234) suggests a different interpretation. The armies of the five Amorrhite Kings had been routed at Gabaon (Josue x. 10), and were being closely pursued by Josue. He was anxious to kill them all (x. 19, 20), for in those days a battle was won only when the enemy had been practically annihilated. By the words—"Move not, O sun," etc., Josue meant: "Can you not wait until I have achieved the victory, before you sink on the horizon?" They were, therefore, merely the expression of an ardent desire of victory, expressed after his prayer to the Lord (x. 12). The "great hailstones that the Lord cast down from heaven" were an answer to his prayer; they killed more of the enemy than the swords of his soldiers, and made it possible for the Jews to win a complete victory before sunset that same day.

Although the miracle of Josue is only of secondary importance in the conquest of Canaan, the sacred writer mentions it, because it was a remarkable fact that had struck the popular imagination, and had been a popular theme for years with the poets of Israel. Is this not written in the Book of the Just? (v. 13.)

Bibliography: Conway, *The Condemnation of Galileo;* Favaro, *Galileo e l'Inquisitione;* Grisar, *Galileistudien;* Jauguey, *Le Procès de Galilée;* Vacandard, *Etudes de Critique.* D. A. iii. 695-860.—D. B. iii. 1684-1689.—D. T. viii. 1548-1574.—E. May, 1917.—R. C. xii. 44; xxix. 575; xl. 209.

JONAS

Are Catholics compelled to believe that the book of Jonas is literal history?

No, the Church has never given any decision on this question. Catholics, nevertheless, are free, if they wish to do so, to regard the book of Jonas as literal history (Driscoll, *C. E.*, viii., 497; Ermoni, *D. B.;* Trochon, *Les Petits Prophètes,* 221; Vigouroux, *Manuel Biblique,* ii., 804, 816), or as an inspired parable, declaring the mercy and goodness of God, and His divine will to save all men (St. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orat.* ii.; *Cf.* Condamin, *D. A.*, 1546-1559; Van Hoonacker, *Les Douze Petits Prophètes*). The arguments for both views are

well summarized in Gigot's *Special Introduction to the Bible* (Part ii., 484-500).

Some scholars have thought that our Lord's reference to Jonas in the whale's belly (Matt. xii. 39, 41; *Cf.* Luke xi. 29, 32) necessarily proved the historical character of the book of Jonas. But Christ may have argued with the Jews on grounds they acknowledged, without raising the question of the historicity of Jonas. Does not the Church in her ritual for the dead ask God to grant to the soul of the dead man "eternal rest with Lazarus, once a beggar?" Does this imply that the Lazarus of our Lord's parable was a real person?

Is not the Bible the only source of faith—the one means whereby the teachings of Christ have been handed down to us?

No, the Bible is not the only source of faith, as Luther taught in the sixteenth century, for without the intervention of a divine, infallible teaching apostolate distinct from the Bible, we could never know with divine certainty what books constitute the inspired Scriptures, or whether the copies we possess to-day agree with the originals.

The Bible itself is but a dead letter calling for a divine interpreter; it is not arranged in systematic form like a creed or catechism; it is often obscure and hard to be understood, as St. Peter says of the Epistles of St. Paul (2 Peter iii. 16; *Cf.* Acts viii. 30, 31); it is open to many a false interpretation. Moreover, a number of revealed truths have been handed down by divine tradition only.

When Luther first put forth this false view of the transmission of divine revelation, he stated that the Bible could be interpreted by everyone, "even by the humble miller's maid, nay by a child of nine," but when the Anabaptists, the Zwinglians and others denied his teaching, the Bible became "a heresy book," most obscure and difficult to understand. Even in his own day his false theory gave rise to many a new heresy. He says himself in 1525: "There are as many sects and beliefs as there are heads. This fellow will have nothing to do with Baptism; another denies the Sacrament; a third believes that there is another world between this and the Last Day. Some teach that Christ is not God; some say this, some that. There is no rustic so rude but that, if he dreams or fancies anything, it must be the whisper of the Holy Ghost, and he himself a prophet" (Grisar, *Luther,* iv., 386-407).

"What did Luther set up," asks a Protestant theologian, "as a principle of interpretation?" He answers: "In *theory* that Scripture interprets itself; in *practice,* however, as it does not

his own theology" (Kohler, *Theol. Literaturzeitung,* 1907 576).

Protestants in practice set aside their theory either by appealing to an inward illumination of the Holy Spirit, or by making reason their one guide. In one case we have the fanaticism of the Anabaptist or the Russellite, in the other the modern liberal critic, who denies every doctrine of the Christian Gospel.

Did not Christ say: "Search (you search—indicative not imperative) the Scriptures, for ye think in them ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of Me" (John v. 39)?

Did not the Bible praise the Bereans for reading the Bible to find out what Jesus taught, for "searching the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so" (Acts xvii. 11)?

Christ is not telling the Jews to read the New Testament, which did not exist, to find out His Gospel, but He is insisting upon the fact that they did read the Old Testament with no profit, because they failed to recognize Him as their Messias. The prophets of the Law taught that He was the Messias, the Son of God, in whom they were to believe in order to have eternal life (John iii. 16).

The Bereans did not read the Scriptures to build up a system of faith and worship, but to see whether St. Paul had correctly cited the Old Testament, and whether his interpretation was true (Bridgett, *The Ritual of the New Testament,* 12, 13).

DIVINE TRADITION

By what right do you teach doctrines not found in the Bible? Does not this practice put the Church above the Word of God? Did not Christ rebuke the Pharisees for "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men" (Matt. xv. 9), and "making the Word of God of none effect through your tradition" (Mark vii. 13)?

Because the Bible nowhere implies that it is the only source of faith. On the contrary St. Paul expressly teaches that Christians must believe not only what he *wrote* but what he *preached.* "Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word, or by our epistle" (2 Thess. ii. 14). "Hold the form of sound words, which thou hast *heard* of me in faith, and in the love which is in Christ Jesus. Keep

the good thing committed to thy trust by the Holy Ghost" (2 Tim. i. 13, 14). "The things which thou hast *heard* of me by many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also" (2 Tim. ii. 2).

The Council of Trent "seeing clearly that this truth and discipline are contained in the written books and the unwritten traditions which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself, or from the Apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand, following the example of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates, with an equal affection of piety, all the books of the Old and New Testaments . . . and also the said traditions . . . preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession" (Sess. iv.).

Christ in the text cited was rebuking the Pharisees for nullifying the fourth commandment by their casuistry (Mark vii. 11, 12; Lagrange, *S. Marc,* 176). The tradition of the Church is not human opinion, but the divine teaching of an infallible Apostolate established by Christ Himself.

The Bible in many passages tells us that the divine teaching of Christ is transmitted to us by teachers accredited by God. St. Matthew speaks of this Apostolate as a divinely authorized teaching of the whole doctrine of Christ to all men of all times, who are to accept it once they are baptized. "All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth. Going, therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world" (Matt. xxviii. 18, 19).

St. Mark speaks of the divine sanction given this "preaching": "Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned" (Mark xvi. 15, 16).

St. Luke speaks of the Apostolate of "preaching in Christ's name to all nations" (xxiv. 27), and declares the Apostles authentic witnesses of a divine revelation, which is infallibly guaranteed by the Holy Ghost: "You shall receive the power of the Holy Ghost coming upon you, and you shall be witnesses (*Cf.* Luke xxiv. 48) unto Me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts i. 8).

St. John speaks of Christ's appointment of St. Peter as the permanent visible head of the teaching Apostolate, chosen to take the place of Christ with power to feed His flock with divine truth (John xxi. 15, 17). At the Last Supper Christ emphasizes the infallibility of the Apostles' perpetual preaching under the

guidance of the Holy Ghost. "I will ask the Father, and He shall give you another Paraclete that He may abide with you forever, the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive: He shall abide with you and be in you" (John xiv. 16, 17; *Cf.* John xiv. 25, 26; xv. 26, 27; xvi. 13).

This Apostolate was not for the Apostles alone, but for their successors, who were always to be received as Christ Himself. "He that heareth you heareth Me; and he that despiseth you despiseth Me; and he that despiseth Me despiseth Him that sent Me" (Luke x. 16).

The teaching of Christ that His Gospel is to be learned not from the Bible alone, but from a divine, infallible Apostolate until the end of the world is clearly set forth by St. Paul. "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? Or how shall they believe Him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach unless they be sent? . . . Faith then cometh by hearing. . . . But I say, Have they not heard? Yes, verily, their sound hath gone forth into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the whole world" (Rom. x. 14-18; *Cf.* Eph. iv. 11-15).

The Apostles always represented themselves as the ambassadors of God (Rom. i. 5; xv. 18; 1 Cor. ii. 16; iii. 9; 1 John iv. 6); they proved their divine mission by miracles (1 Cor. ii. 4; 2 Cor. xii. 12; 1 Thess. i. 5); they required all the faithful to obey their divine message (Rom. i. 5; 2 Cor. x. 4-6); they anathematized those who refused to accept it. "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema" (Gal. i. 8; *Cf.* Mark xv. 16).

That men were to learn the Gospel not from their private interpretation of the Bible, but from this permanent Apostolate, is clear from the fact that the Apostles appointed successors to themselves, and ordered them in turn to appoint others to carry on their work. "Hold the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me. . . . Keep the good thing committed to thy trust by the Holy Ghost who dwelleth in us" (2 Tim. i. 13, 14). "The things which thou hast heard of me by many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also" (2 Tim. ii. 2).

St. Irenæus (140-205), Bishop of Lyons in the second century, clearly taught that all Christians were to learn the Gospel from the tradition of the Apostles and their successors, especially from the tradition of the Apostolic See of Rome. He writes: "Therefore in every Church there is the tradition of the Apostles made manifest throughout the whole world; and we can enu-

merate those who were by the Apostles instituted Bishops in the Churches, and the successors of those Bishops down to ourselves." Then after mentioning Smyrna, which through St. Polycarp (d. 155) takes us back to St. John, he adds: "But it would be too long to enumerate here the successions of all the Churches; it suffices to point out the Apostolic tradition, the teaching that has come down to us by Episcopal succession in the Church of Rome, the greatest and most ancient of all, known everywhere, and founded in Rome by the two glorious Apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul. This tradition suffices of itself to confound all those who, in one way or another, by self-conceit, vain glory, blindness or erroneous judgment, have deviated from the truth. Indeed, the superior preeminence of that Church is such that every Church—I mean the faithful of any country whatever—necessarily agrees with her, that is, every Church in any country in which the Apostolic tradition has been preserved without interruption" (*Adv. Hær.,* iii., 3).

About fifty years later we find Origen (185-255) in the preface of his *De Principiis* strongly condemning the current heretical opinion that the Bible was the sole source of faith. He says: "That alone must be believed to be truth which differs in nothing from the ecclesiastical and Apostolical tradition."

Bibliography: Agius, *Tradition and the Church;* Duchesne, *Churches Separated from Rome,* 79; Wilhelm-Scannell, *A Manual of Catholic Theology,* i., 16-32. M. July, 1929.

THE SO-CALLED VICIOUS CIRCLE

Do not Catholics reason in a circle when they prove a teaching Apostolate by the Bible, and then the Bible by this teaching Apostolate?

We do not reason in a circle. If we were to prove the Apostolate from the inspired Scriptures, and then the inspired Scriptures from the Apostolate, we would be guilty of the fallacy of the vicious circle. On the contrary we do not in any way pre-suppose that the books of the New Testament are inspired, but only that they are genuine, authentic documents written by honest men. We allow the words of Christ and His Apostles to speak for themselves, without appealing to the authority of the Church.

The Bible proves that the Church's claims were the same in the beginning as they are now, while the Church pledges the authority it has received from Christ in support of the inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible. Thus both Bible and Church depend on the authority of our Lord. The Church also appeals to the Bible as a contemporary record of historical facts.

When two independent witnesses confirm each other's evidence, the argument for the truthfulness of both is not circular, but cumulative.

TRANSLATIONS OF THE BIBLE

Was not Luther the first to translate the Bible into the vernacular? Why did Catholics object to it so strongly at the time?

No, Luther was not the first to translate the Bible into the vernacular. His translation of the New Testament was not published until 1522, and his version of the Old Testament not until 1534. Catholics from 1466 to 1522 had already published fourteen complete editions of the Bible in High German at Augsburg, Basle, Strassburg and Nuremburg, and five in Low German at Cologne, Delf, Halberstadt and Lubeck (Janssen, *History of the German People*, xiv., 388). During this same period—from 1450 to 1520—Catholics had published 156 Latin and 6 Hebrew editions of the Bible, besides issuing complete translations in Italian (11), French (10), Bohemian (2), Flemish (1), Limousine (1), and Russian (1) (Falk, *Die Bibel am Ausgange des Mittelalters*).

Catholics objected to Luther's German translation, because, as Emser wrote at the time, "He has in many places confused, stultified and perverted the old trustworthy text of the Christian Church to its great disadvantage, and also poisoned it with heretical glosses and prefaces. . . . He almost everywhere forces the Scriptures on the question of faith and works, even when neither faith nor works are thought of" (Janssen, *History of the German People*, xiv., 425). Emser points out 1,400 inaccuracies, while Bunsen, a Protestant scholar, mentions 3,000. Luther ridiculed Ecclesiastes, rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse as not Apostolic, omitted the two books of Machabees because they mentioned prayers for the dead, and called the Epistle of St. James "an epistle of straw," because it clearly contradicted his false doctrine on good works. He deliberately perverted the meaning of St. Paul in Romans, by adding the words "only" (nur) in Rom. iii. 20 and Rom. iv. 15, and "alone" (allein) in Rom. iii. 28. When this interpolation was pointed out to him by Catholic critics, he wrote: "If your new Papist makes much ado about the word 'alone,' just say straight out to him: 'Dr. Luther will have it so, and says, Papist and donkey are one and the same thing; thus I will and am determined to have it; my will is the reason'" (*Ibid.*, 419).

We can therefore readily understand why Luther's faulty translation was prohibited in the Duchy of Saxony, Austria and the Mark of Brandenburg, while Catholic scholars like Dietenberger (1534), Eck (1537), and Blanchardt (1547), published faithful translations of the Bible both in High and Low German.

Bibliography: Falk, *Bibelstudien;* Panzer, *Kath. Bibelübersetzungen; Kirchenlexicon of Wetzer and Welte,* ii., 899).

Was not the Bible practically unknown in the Middle Ages, when your Church was dominant?

No, Luther's statement that before his time "the Bible lay under the bench forgotten in the dust" is simply not true. Indeed the Bible was "the most widely circulated book in the Middle Ages, and had a great influence on the life of the nations" (Michael, *Geschichte der Deutschen Volkes,* iii., 223). The priests used it in preparing their sermons, and knew it from their daily reading of the missal and the breviary. The monks copied the Scriptures in their *scriptoria,* and meditated upon them frequently as we learn from the pages of St. Bernard and Thomas à Kempis (*The Imitation of Christ,* iv., 11; Luddy, *Life of St. Bernard*). The laity, before printing was invented and when Bible manuscripts were rare and costly, knew the Scriptures from listening to sermons, and from studying the sculpture, paintings, frescoes and mosaics that filled their churches. What a comprehensive view of both the Old Testament and the New could be had by a parishioner of St. Mark's in Venice in the thirteenth century. As Ruskin says: "The walls of the Church became the poor man's Bible, and a picture was more easily read than a chapter" (*The Stones of Venice,* ii., 99).

Many non-Catholics have answered the above question in the negative. "It is no longer possible to hold," says Kropatscheck, "as the old polemics did, that the Bible was a sealed book to both theologians and laity. The more we study the Middle Ages, the more does this fable tend to dissolve into thin air" (*Das Schriftprincip der Luth. Kirche,* 163). "We must admit," writes Dobschütz, "that the Middle Ages possessed a quite surprising and extremely praiseworthy knowledge of the Bible, such as might in many respects put our own age to shame" (*Deutsche Rundschau,* 1900, 61). "There is," writes Dr. Cutts, "a good deal of popular misapprehension about the way in which the Bible was regarded in the Middle Ages. Some people think that it was very little read, even by the clergy; whereas the fact is that the sermons of the medieval preachers are more full of Scriptural quotations and allusions than any sermons in these days; and the writers on other subjects are so full of Scriptural allusion, that it is evident their minds were saturated

with Scriptural diction" (*Turning Points of English History,* 200).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Gigot, *Biblical Lectures;* Janssen, *History of the German People,* xiv.; Grisar, *Luther,* v., 536, 542.

Was not the Bible first translated into English by John Wyclif? Did not your Church show her hostility to any translation of the Bible into English by proscribing the translations of Wyclif and Tyndale?

No, Cardinal Gasquet has proved that the so-called Wyclifite Bibles in existence to-day are really the old English Catholic Bibles, mentioned by Blessed Thomas More, who wrote: "The whole Bible was long before his (Wyclif's) day, by virtuous and well-learned men, translated into the English tongue, and by good and godly people and with devotion and soberness, well and reverently read" (*English Works,* 233).

Wyclif's translation was condemned by the Council of Oxford under Archbishop Arundel in 1408, because he introduced into it his heretical views. It ordered that no translation should be made, until "it shall have been approved by the Bishop of the place or by the provincial council." Blessed Thomas More thus comments on this law: "I trow that in this law you see nothing unreasonable. For it neither forbiddeth the translations to be read that were already well done of old before Wyclif's day, nor damneth his because it was new, but because it was naught; nor prohibiteth new to be made, but provideth that they shall not be read, if they be made amiss, till they be by good examination amended."

Tyndale's translation of the New Testament was burned at St. Paul's by Bishop Tunstall in 1530 for the same reason. It was a faulty translation containing some 2,000 mistakes, and purposely garbling words and texts to set forth Luther's new teachings. The Bishops of those days banned it just as a modern State prohibits the circulation of counterfeit money. In their eyes it did not represent the pure word of God.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Cardinal Gasquet, *The Eve of the Reformation,* viii.

BIBLE READING

Are Catholics to-day forbidden to read the Bible?

They are not forbidden but encouraged to read the Bible. The Catholic Church, as the guardian and interpreter of the Scriptures, must needs prevent her people from being led

astray by false translations of the Bible, which are often accompanied by glosses and notes destructive of the Catholic faith. But she never has prohibited versions in the vernacular which have been approved by the Bishops of the various countries, and have been edited with explanatory notes by Catholic scholars.

On the title page of our English Bibles we may read the letter (April, 1778) of Pius VI to the Archbishop of Florence, wherein he urges Catholics to read the Bible. He writes: "At a time when a great many books which grossly attack the Catholic religion are being circulated even among the unlearned, to the great destruction of souls, you judge exceedingly well that the faithful should be urged to read the Holy Scriptures; for they are the most abundant sources which ought to be left open to everyone, to draw from them purity of morals and of doctrine, and to eradicate the errors which are so widely spread in these corrupt times."

Pius VII a few years later wrote in the same strain to the English Vicars-Apostolic, asking them "to encourage their people to read the Holy Scriptures; for nothing can be more useful, more consoling, and more animating, inasmuch as they serve to confirm the faith, support the hope, and influence the charity of the true Christian."

Leo XIII, in his Encyclical on the Bible (1893), writes: "The solicitude of the Apostolic office naturally urges, and even compels us, not only to desire that this great source of Catholic revelation should be made safely and abundantly accessible to the flock of Jesus Christ, but also not to suffer any attempt to defile or corrupt it. . . . (By reading the Scriptures) the intelligence will be illuminated and strengthened . . . and at the same time the heart will grow warm, and will strive with ardent longing to advance in virtue and divine love."

Pope Benedict XV, in his Encyclical on St. Jerome, quotes St. Jerome's letter to Demetrias for all Catholics: "Love the Bible and wisdom will love you; love it and it will preserve you; honor it and it will embrace you" (*Epis.*, CXXX., 20). The Pope next cites St. Jerome's letters to the Roman matron, Laeta, and to Eustochium, in which he urges his pupils to "read the Bible assiduously," adding: "No one can fail to see what profit and sweet tranquillity must result in well disposed souls from a devout reading of the Bible. Whoever comes to it in piety, faith and humility, and with a determination to make progress in it, will assuredly find therein and will eat "the Bread that cometh down from heaven"; he will, in his own person, experience the truth of David's words: "The hidden and uncertain things of Thy Wisdom Thou hast made manifest to me."

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. G. Oct., Nov., 1928.

Why do Catholics object to the reading of the Bible in the public schools?

Because in some States where Protestantism was dominant, the reading of the Bible in the public schools was made the occasion of introducing in the opening exercises all the elements of a Protestant religious service, a practice contrary to the spirit of the American Constitution.

For example, some Catholic residents of the Board of Education, District 24, of the State of Illinois, brought suit to have the Board of Education discontinue in the schools the reading of the Bible, the singing of hymns, and the reciting of the King James version of the Lord's Prayer. Their petition stated "that certain teachers in these public schools habitually read to the children during school hours, portions of the King James Bible selected by the teachers; that the Lord's Prayer as found in the King James Bible was recited and hymns were sung in concert by the pupils; that during these exercises the children were required to stand up and assume a devotional attitude; that from time to time pupils were asked to explain the meaning of scriptural passages, etc., etc."

While the Circuit Court of Scott County dismissed the petition, the Supreme Court of Illinois, June 29, 1910, reversed this judgment, and held "that the stated exercises constituted sectarian instruction, and made the public school a house of worship in violation of the Illinois Constitution, Art. 3, Sect. 2, and Art. 8, Sect. 3."

The Supreme Courts of Wisconsin (March 18, 1890), Nebraska (Oct. 8, 1902) and Louisiana (April 12, 1915) have rendered similar decisions. The fact that in some schools Catholics and Jewish children were not required to attend the opening exercises, only emphasized the unfairness of the school board, for, as the judges declared, "the exclusion of a pupil from the school exercises separated him from his fellows, put him in a class by himself, deprived him of his equality with the other pupils, subjected him to a religious stigma, and placed him at a disadvantage in the school, which the law never contemplated" (*Decision of the Illinois Supreme Court*).

Catholics object to having an incorrect version of the Bible read and often commented upon in the public schools by men and women of every creed and no creed, who as a rule know little or nothing of its true meaning, and who often regard it as a mere human book, devoid of all divine inerrancy and inspiration.

Bibliography: *Private Schools and State Law*, ch. ii.; N. C. W. C. Washington, D. C., *The Bible in the Public School.*

CHAINED BIBLES

Why did the monks of the Middle Ages chain the Bible in their libraries and churches?

The Bible and other books were chained in the libraries and churches of the Middle Ages to preserve them from theft, and especially to make them accessible to students.

The first mention of chained Bibles occurs in the catalogue of St. Peter's Monastery of Wiessenburg, Alsace, in 1040, which mentions four Psalters chained in the monastery church. Most medieval libraries stored their books in locked chests and presses, for we do not come across any other mention of chained libraries until the fifteenth century. All the books of St. Mark's Library in Florence (1441) and of the Malatesta Library in Cesena (1452) were chained.

Throughout the Middle Ages it was deemed a pious work to bequeath Bibles, Psalters and Books of Hours to be chained in church for common use. Count Frederick of Heidelberg bequeathed his Book of Hours to the Holy Ghost Church in 1474; a Catholic of Leyden, Holland, his Bible to St. Peter's Church; and the Earl of Ormond his Psalter to be chained to his tomb at St. Thomas Acon.

The Reformers adopted this custom of having chained Bibles in their churches, and the practice lasted for over three hundred years. There were chained libraries at Grantham (1598), Bolton (1651) and Wimborne (1686), England, and chained Bibles in most of the English churches (Chelsea, East Winch, Evesham, Minehead, Milton, Shorwell, Stratford). The Oxford Colleges of Eton, Brasenose and Merton did not remove the chains until the eighteenth century, while some libraries removed them only in the nineteenth (Manchester, Cirencester, Llanbadarn).

At the present time we have records of over five thousand chained books in eleven Protestant and two Catholic libraries. A list of chained books in England has been compiled by William Blades in his *Books in Chains,* and by Charles Cox and Alfred Harvey in *English Church Furniture.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Lenhart, *Chained Bibles;* Savage, *Old English Libraries.*

OBLIGATIONS OF CONVERTS

What are the conditions of entrance into the Catholic Church? Must a convert from one of the other churches be rebaptized, and confess the sins of a lifetime?

The Catholic Church requires of all adults, who seek admission into her fold, a supernatural sorrow for all past sins, and a

firm belief in all the teachings of Christ and His Apostles, as handed down from the beginning by the written and the unwritten tradition of Christ's one divine Church. Converts are required to study carefully under the guidance of some priest an approved catechism, *i. e.,* a brief summary of Catholic belief and practice.

A member of one of the other churches is always asked to take the following oath upon the Gospels, before he is baptized: "With a sincere heart, therefore, and with unfeigned faith, I detest and abjure every error, heresy and sect, opposed to the said Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church. So help me God, and these His holy Gospels which I touch with my hand."

If a convert is certain of the validity of his Baptism, he is bound only to confess the mortal sins he has committed after Baptism. If he is not certain of its validity, he is baptized conditionally with the words: *"If thou art not baptized,* I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." He then receives the Sacrament of Penance conditionally, so that he is certainly forgiven by one Sacrament or the other.

As Baptism impresses a character, *i. e.,* "a certain spiritual, indelible sign" (Council of Trent, Sess. vii., can. 9) upon the soul, it cannot be repeated.

If I, as a Lutheran, have taken an oath at my confirmation to die in the Church of my baptism, can I honestly go against that oath and become a Catholic? I believe that the religion of my parents is good enough for me.

As soon as you believe that the Catholic Church is the one true Church, the oath you took in good faith as a Lutheran is no longer binding. An oath to do wrong is sinful and of no effect, whether it be an oath like Herod's which brought about the death of John the Baptist (Matt. xiv. 7-10), or an oath to remain in known heresy and schism.

If your parents were poor, would that prevent you from try ing to better your condition? Not in the slightest degree. As soon as you become convinced of the poverty of the partial Gospel you possess, you must, as a thinking man, better your spiritual condition by accepting without question "the unsearchable riches" of Christ's one true Gospel.

Are not converts to your Church required, by the profession of faith they make on entering it, to hate their relatives and friends?

No, they are asked to detest heresy which is a denial of

God's truth, and to detest schism, which is a withdrawal from Christ's one true Church (Matt. vii. 15; xii. 25; xviii. 17; Rom. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. i. 10; Gal. i. 9; Eph. iv. 4; Heb. xiii. 7, 9); they are not, and cannot be, asked to hate anyone.

The love of all the brethren is a proof of our love of God. The First Commandment according to our Lord was: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God. . . . And the Second is like to it: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is no other commandment greater than these" (Mark xii. 29-31). And St. John teaches: "If any man say I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar. For he that loveth not his brother whom he seeth, how can he love God whom he seeth not" (1 John iv. 20).

A convert on the contrary will love his relatives and friends more than ever, because he has drawn nearer to God and His Christ. He will pray for their conversion daily, and offer up many a Mass and Communion that they too may see the light, and be given the grace to be "obedient to the heavenly vision" (Acts xxvi. 19).

My mother—a good soul and a sincere Protestant—assures me that it will break her heart if I become a Catholic. I believe all the teachings of your Church, but find it hard to grieve one dear to me by becoming a convert.

The true Christian ought not to hesitate a moment about joining the Catholic Church, once he is convinced of the truth of her divine claims. To be false to conscience is to imperil one's soul's salvation. Our Lord said plainly: "Everyone, therefore, that shall confess Me before men, I will also confess him before My Father who is in heaven. But he that shall deny Me before men, I will also deny him before My Father who is in heaven" (Matt. x. 32, 33).

Our Lord knew full well that converts would often meet bitter opposition on the part of their relatives and friends, when they contemplated entering His true Church, but He clearly taught that He must come first. "For I come to set a man at variance with his father, and the daughter against her mother. . . . He that loveth father or mother more than Me, is not worthy of Me" (Matt. x. 35, 37).

The Fourth Commandment, "Honor thy father and thy mother," does not require obedience to parents, when they command something contrary to God's law, for as St. Peter says: "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts v. 29). Grown up children need not obey their parents when they propose to marry, to enter religion, or to follow the dictates of their conscience in embracing the true faith.

THE CHURCH A DIVINE SOCIETY

Did Christ really establish a society which all men were bound to join? or did He not rather insist upon certain spiritual doctrines, which His disciples were to realize as best they could?

Catholics believe with the Vatican Council "that in order to perpetuate the saving work of Redemption, the Eternal Bishop of souls decreed to establish a Holy Church, to which all the faithful might be gathered together by the unity of faith and love, as in the house of God."

The Bible plainly teaches that Christ established a divine society, when He gave the Apostles the power to teach (Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15), to govern (Matt. xviii. 18; John xx. 21), and to sanctify the souls of men (Matt. xxviii. 20; John xx. 22; Luke xxii. 19). Christ's true followers are to accept their teaching (Mark xvi. 16), obey their commandments (Luke x. 16; Matt. xviii. 17), and to use the divine means of sanctification (John iii. 5; vi. 54) which Christ instituted.

The Church is a divine society, divine in its origin, and supernatural in its end and means. It is, therefore, unfailing and perpetual, always opposed by the world as was Christ, her divine Founder, and always conquering her enemies, as Christ once won the victory of the Resurrection through the seeming failure of the Cross.

The Church is at the same time a human society, because it consists of human members. That is why scandals, heresies and schisms arise. Christ Himself foretold this, when He compared the Kingdom of God to a field in which cockle grew together with the wheat; or to a net containing good fish and bad (Matt. xiii. 24, 47).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: D'Arcy, *Catholicism;* Bagshawe, *The Church; The Threshold of the Catholic Church: The Credentials of the Catholic Church;* Bainvel, *De Ecclesia Christi;* Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism;* Benson, *The City on a Hill;* Berry, *The Church of Christ;* Brunhes, *Christianisme et Catholicisme;* Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia;* Dorsch, *De Ecclesia Christi;* Duchesne, *Churches Separated from Rome;* Finlay, *The Church of Christ;* Fortescue, *The Eastern Orthodox Church;* D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia Christi;* Lattey (ed.), *The Church;* Lockhart, *The Old Religion;* McLaughlin, *The Divine Plan of the Church;* Maguire, *Is Schism Lawful?;* Manning, *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost;* Mathew (ed.), *Ecclesia, the Church of Christ;* Maturin, *The Price of Unity;* Moran, *The Government of the Church in the First Century;* Murray, *De Ecclesia;* O'Connell, *The Church and the Bible;* Phelan, *The Straight Path;* Scholfield, *Divine Authority;* Sertillanges, *The Church;* Straub, *De Ecclesia Christi;* Woodlock, *Constantinople, Canterbury and Rome.* D. A. i. 1219-1301.—D. T. iv. 2108-2224.

THE PERPETUITY OF THE CHURCH

Is it not a fact that the Catholic Church became corrupt and so changed by the sixteenth century, that it no longer represented the Church that Christ established?

No, this is not a fact, although the sixteenth century Reformers made this false assertion, so as to give their followers a pretext for establishing their various separatist sects. The nineteenth century Modernists, misled by their false theory of the relativity of truth, have also been compelled to make the defectibility of the Church the first article of their rationalistic creed.

While human societies and states have a natural tendency to become corrupt and perish in the course of time, a supernatural, divine society like the Catholic Church cannot fail or become corrupt, for its Divine Founder, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit are to abide with it until the end of the world (Matt. xvii. 10; John xiv. 16). The prophets of the Old Law always declared that the Kingdom of Christ would be a lasting Kingdom (Dan. ii. 44; Isa. ix. 6, 7), a teaching confirmed by Christ in the parables of the cockle (Matt. xiii. 24-41) and the net (Matt. xiii. 47-50). Moreover our Lord explicitly promised that "the gates of hell (*i. e.*, the power of death or the power of the devil) shall not prevail against it" (the Church).

It is true that parts of the Church may be corrupted by heresy and schism, as in the days of Arianism, of the Eastern Schism, and of the Protestant Reformation. But as St. Cyprian says: "Though tares be seen in the Church, neither our faith nor our charity ought to be impeded, so that we withdraw ourselves from the Church. We ought simply to strive that we may be true wheat; that we may receive fruit according to our labor" (*Epis.* 51). In another letter (*Ad Cornelium*, 55) he tells us that the faithful, who are mindful of the Gospel, ought not to be scandalized if certain proud men leave the Church of God, for some of the early disciples abandoned Christ (John vi. 66), and both He and His Apostles foretold the apostasy of many Christians.

Bibliography: C. W. xlix. 761.

THE REFORMATION

Will you not admit that a Reformation was needed in the sixteenth century, and that Luther's great reform made people better? Were the Popes of his time, Leo

X and Clement VII, at all anxious for reform? How do you account for such a widespread movement against your Church?

Catholics readily grant that a reformation in the lives of many unworthy Catholic clerics and laymen was indeed called for in the sixteenth century, and historians like Pastor have admitted the worldliness, immorality, nepotism, and avarice that marked many of the clergy (*History of the Popes,* vii., 291-328). Pastor, however, warns us against the unfair exaggerations of bigoted controversialists, and gives us a list of eighty-eight saints and *beati* who died in Italy alone between the years 1400 and 1529 (*Ibid.,* v., 86-88). He says well: "The records of all nations consist of the stories of crimes. Virtue goes quietly on her way; vice and lawlessness are always making a noise. The scapegoat is the talk of the town; the honest man does his duty, and no one hears of him" (*Ibid.,* 10).

Catholics, however, hold that a Reformation in the sense of a secession from the Church established by Christ, fostered by kings and princes desirous of the Church's lands and revenues, and denying the divine doctrines, government and worship of the Gospel, could not be of God. The good Catholic remained within the fold, and prayed and worked for reform, like a St. Canisius or a St. Charles Borromeo; the immoral Catholic, like Henry VIII of England, or the Landgrave Philip of Hesse, apostatized.

It is true indeed that Leo X (1517-1521) and Clement VII (1523-1534) did not measure up to their task, as Pastor admits (*Ibid.,* vii., 9), but we must not forget that the Council of Trent, which was to bring about the Counter-Reformation, was retarded not by the Popes, but by the princes of the time.

Döllinger in his book on *The Reformation: Its Interior Development and Effects,* shows from Protestant writers alone that the Reformation in Germany, instead of helping matters, led to intellectual, social, moral and religious deterioration. Luther himself writes: "Now we see the people becoming more infamous, more avaricious, more unmerciful, more unchaste, and in every way worse than they were under Popery." . . . He calls his own town of Wittenberg "a Sodom of immorality," and adds that "although half the town is guilty of adultery, usury, theft and cheating, no one tries to put the law in force" (Grisar, *Luther,* iv., 210, 215). An Elizabethan Protestant Bishop, Pilkington, thus writes of England after the revolt: "We have long contemned the Pope's curse, that now we think we may live as we list without blame; and if any due correction be offerred, we laugh it to scorn, despise the ministers of it, and by this means shall cause the Lord to take the whip into His own

hands, and then who shall be able to stand?" (*Nehemiah*, 388.)

The chief cause of the Reformation was the gradual weakening of the bond of Catholic unity and faith during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The antipathy to the Holy See on the continent began with Philip the Fair's quarrel with Boniface VIII (1285-1378), and was intensified by the residence of the Popes at Avignon (1309-1376), the rebellion of Louis of Bavaria (1314-1346), and the Great Western Schism (1378-1417). The Black Death (1348-1350), which killed more than one third of Western Europe in two years, had lowered greatly the standard of culture among the clergy, and hastened the development of a narrow nationalism, which resented the clergy's financial power, and lusted for the wealth the Church had accumulated down the centuries. The weakening of moral discipline among the clergy and people was the chief factor in bringing about the Protestant revolt. A faithful, devout body of Christians, in the first three centuries, died gladly for the faith; the worldly, avaricious, and immoral Christians of the sixteenth century easily lost the faith that they had ceased to practice.

Bibliography: Belloc, *How the Reformation Happened;* Funk, *Manual of Church History*, ii., 81-131; Mourret, *Histoire Generale de l'Eglise*, v., 275-457. C. W. xxxviii. 194; xciv. 26, 359.

SAVONAROLA

Did not Savonarola in the fifteenth century fail to bring about the reform that Luther accomplished in the sixteenth? Was not Savonarola a precursor of the Reformation?

No, Savonarola was in no sense a precursor of the Reformation, although the Protestants of Germany tried to make the unthinking believe this, by placing the Catholic Dominican alongside the Protestants grouped about the Lutheran memorial at Worms. This calumny has been ably refuted by many scholars, such as Capponi, Dittrich, Frantz, Hergenröther, Pastor, Villari, and others.

In his *Triumph of the Cross*, Savonarola puts apostasy from the Church in the same category as apostasy from Christ (iv., 6). Although some of his works have been placed upon the Index, the greater part of his writings are Catholic to the core. As Proctor says: "Savonarola's life, teaching and creed were the very antithesis of the life, teaching and creed of the Reformers

They left the cloister for the world; he left the world for the cloister, and was ever true to his vows. They began by self-deformation, on their own admission; he by self-reformation, on the evidence of friend and foe. They dragged down public morality on their own showing; he raised it to the highest perfection. They aimed at reforming creed and doctrine, he reformed morals and men, upholding always doctrine and creed. They denied what he taught; the necessity of good works, the need of the Sacraments as channels of grace, transubstantiation, rites and ceremonies, loyalty to Peter's See, and devotion to the Mother of God. How, then, can he be their "leader," their "harbinger," who condemns and anathematizes them all (*Savonarola and the Reformation*).

He had one fault. "In his burning zeal for the reformation of morals he allowed himself to be carried away into violent attacks on men of all classes, including his superiors, and he completely forgot that, according to the teaching of the Church, an evil life cannot deprive the Pope or any other ecclesiastical authority of his lawful jurisdiction" (Pastor, *History of the Popes*, vi., 53). As Cardinal Newman well said: "He thought too much of himself, and rose up against a power which no one can attack without injuring himself. No good can come of disobedience; that was not the way to become the Apostle of either Florence or Rome."

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bayonne, *Étude sur J. Savonarole;* Gherardi, *Nuovi Documenti Intorno a G. Savonarola;* Leclercq, *Les Martyrs,* vi., 323, 368; Lottini, *Fu Veramente Scomunicato il Savonarola?;* Lucas, *Savonarola;* Luotto, *Il Vero Savonarola;* O'Neil, *Was Savonarola Really Excommunicated?;* Schnitzer, *Savonarola, Ein Kulturbild aus der Zeit der Renaissance.* A. Q. 1898, 692.—C. W. xvii. 289, 433, 577; lxvi. 487.—C. G. Feb., March, 1927.—D. A. xxii. 1215-1228.

THE VISIBILITY OF THE CHURCH

Were not Luther and Calvin right in teaching that the Church was composed only of the just and the predestined? If so, it is visible to God alone.

Did not Jesus teach: "The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation . . . the Kingdom of God is within you" (Luke xvii. 20, 21)? and again: "God is a Spirit; and they that worship Him, must worship Him in spirit and in truth" (John iv. 24)?

No, the heretical teaching of Luther and Calvin was condemned by the Council of Trent, and again by the Council of

the Vatican, which defined as an article of the faith the visibility of the Church. "God established a Church through His Only-Begotten Son, and endowed it with manifest marks of its institution, that it might be known by all as the guardian and teacher of the revealed word" (Sess. iii., cap. 3).

How could our Lord require us to believe under penalty of damnation (Mark xvi. 18), and to consider the Christian disobedient to the Church's commands "a heathen and a publican" (Matt. xviii. 17), if we could not easily recognize the Church as a visible society? Frequently the New Testament represents the Church as an external, visible society, calling it the house of God (1 Tim. ii. 15), a kingdom (Matt. iv. 23; xiii. 24), a field (Matt. xiii. 24), a grain of mustard seed that becometh a tree (Matt. xiii. 31), a city seated on a mountain (Matt. v. 14), a sheep-fold (John x. 16), a flock (Acts xx. 28).

As Cardinal Newman once said: "The Church is not a secret society," but a visible society, whose members, known to all their enemies, will be persecuted, as our Lord foretold, for His sake (Matt. v. 11; Luke vi. 22). As Christ, "the True Light, which enlighteneth every man" (John i. 9), was visible to the men of Galilee and Judea, so His followers, "the light of the world," (Matt. v. 14), are to be known by their following in His footsteps (John viii. 12).

St. Paul declares the Church visible to the faithful, so that they may know whom to obey and whom to believe (Eph. iv. 11-14), and to those outside the fold, so that they may accept with certainty a divinely accredited ambassador of the Gospel of peace (Rom. x. 14, 15).

The Fathers of both East and West often compare the Church to the sun and the moon, because "she enlightens all under heaven" (Athanasius, *In* Ps. lxxxviii. 38), or because as St. John Chrysostom says, "It is easier for the sun to be quenched, than for the Church to be made invisible." They teach plainly the visibility of the Church, when they comment upon "the City seated upon a mountain that cannot be hid" (Matt. v. 14), *v. g.*, St. Hilary (*Comm. In Matt.*); St. Augustine (*Epis.*, lii., 1).

In Luke xvii. we find the Pharisees asking when the Kingdom of God will come. Our Lord answers that it has already commenced, but that they had failed to recognize it, because it came "not with observation," *i. e.*, not possessed with earthly power. The more correct reading is "among you," not "within you" (Lagrange, *Evangile selon S. Luc*, 460).

In John iv., Christ reminds the Samaritan woman that the Christian worship is *spiritual*, not limited either to Mount Garizim or Jerusalem, and *true*, not consisting in lip service (Isa. xlix. 13; Matt. xv. 8), but in sincere, internal acceptance of God's truth (Lagrange, *Evangile selon S. Jean*, 114).

THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH

Why do you arrogantly claim that your Church is infallible?

Because she alone represents Christ, the Divine, Infallible Teacher, in conduct, belief and worship. She alone says to the world as Christ did: "I am the Way (conduct), the Truth (belief) and the Life (worship)" (John xiv. 5).

Reason and revelation alike demand that the teacher of the divine revelation of Christ speak as He did, infallibly, *i.e.,* that she by divine guidance be ever kept free from the liability of error. A non-Catholic writer, Mallock, in his *Is Life Worth Living?,* 267, states the Catholic doctrine well. He says: "Any supernatural religion that renounces its claim to this (infallibility), it is clear, can profess to be a semi-revelation only. It is a hybrid thing, partly natural and partly supernatural, and it thus practically has all the qualities of a religion that is wholly natural. In so far as it professes to be revealed, it of course professes to be infallible; but if the revealed part be in the first place hard to distinguish, and in the second place hard to understand; if it may mean many things, and many of these things contradictory, it might as well never have been made at all. To make it in any sense an infallible revelation, or in other words a revelation at all *to us,* we need a power to interpret the testament that shall have equal authority with that testament itself."

Would a good God, who "wills all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. ii. 4), fail to provide His revelation with a living infallible witness? Would a just God command us to believe under penalty of hell (Mark xvi. 16), and at the same time leave us to the mercy of every false prophet (Matt. xiii. 21) and lying teacher (2 Peter ii. 1), preaching a Gospel opposed to His (Gal. i. 8)?

No, the Church Christ founded is everywhere spoken of in the New Testament as a divine, infallible teaching authority. Christ says that His Church is like a city firmly built upon a rock foundation, which can never be destroyed by Satan and the powers of evil (Matt. xvi. 18; *Cf.* Matt. vii. 24; Ps. cxvi. 5).

Throughout the Gospels the mission of the Apostles and their successors is declared identical with the mission of Christ and His heavenly Father. "As the Father sends Me (to give infallible witness to the truth, John xviii. 37; *Cf.* Matt. i. 38), I send you" (John xx. 21), "He that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth Me" (John xiii. 20), "He that receiveth you, receiveth Me; and he that receiveth Me, receiveth Him that sent Me" (Matt. x. 40; *Cf.* Luke x. 16; John xii. 44-48; John xv. 20, 24).

"We are of God," says St. John. "He that knoweth God, heareth us. He that is not of God heareth us not. By this you know the Spirit of truth, and the spirit of error" (1 John iv. 6).

When Christ gave the Apostles their divine commission for all nations until the end of the world (Matt. xxviii. 20), He promised: "I am with you always." This phrase is used at least ninety times in the Bible, and outside of the few instances in which it implies a mere salutation (Ruth ii. 4; Rom. xv. 33), it signifies that God will ensure the success of the person's undertaking (Gen. xxxix. 2; Exod. iii. 12; Jer. i. 19; Num. xiv. 42). If the Apostles are to be successful in their divine mission of teaching for all time, they and their successors must needs be infallible.

In His last discourse to the Apostles our Saviour promised to send them the Holy Ghost, who would abide with them forever, and teach them all things that He had taught them (John xiv. 26). He is the Spirit of Truth, whom the world of unbelievers (John xv. 19; xvii. 9, 25) cannot receive (John xiv. 13-17, 25, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 13). The Church that witnesses (Luke xxiv. 28; Acts i. 9) to Christ must be infallible.

The Apostles always declare that their teaching is the Word of God (Acts iv. 31; viii. 14; xii. 24; xiii. 44; xv. 35; 1 Cor. xiv. 35; 2 Tim. ii. 9), which they voice infallibly by the assistance of the Holy Spirit (Acts ii. 4; iv. 31; xv. 25-28; 1 Cor. ii. 4-16), who confirms their witness by miracles (Acts iii. 16; iv. 29-31; v. 12, 16; ix. 32-42). All other teaching is false and blasphemous, even if it were to come from an angel of God (Acts xiii. 18; Gal. i. 8, 9).

The Catholic Church with St. Paul says to her children: "When you had received of us the word of the hearing of God, you received it not as the word of men, but as it is indeed, the word of God" (1 Thess. i. 5, 6). She is "the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. iii. 13), a metaphor of the Apostle, that evidently signifies unshaken firmness in witnessing to the truth of Christ (Jer. i. 18; Col. i. 23; Apoc. iii. 12).

If you study the writings of the early Fathers of the Church, the various Creeds, and the Councils of the Church from Jerusalem to the Council of the Vatican, you must needs admit that the Church always considered herself infallible, condemning as a heretic outside her fold anyone who denied even one dogma of the Faith. As St. Irenæus said in the second century: "Where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God, and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace. For the Spirit is the truth" (*Adv. Hær.*, iii., 24).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Lyons, *Christianity and Infallibility;* McNabb, *Infallibility*. A. Q. 1890, 67.—C. W. xiii. 577; xxxviii. 51, 322.—I. T. Oct., 1907.

FREEDOM OF THOUGHT AND INFALLIBILITY

Is not your doctrine of infallibility opposed to freedom of thought? Is not a Catholic hampered in his search for truth by a blind, degrading obedience to the claims of an infallible Church?

The doctrine of infallibility is indeed opposed to the false freedom of believing error, but not to the true freedom of believing the truth. We have no right to believe what is false, any more than we have a right to do what is evil. Our Savior plainly taught us that error and sin imply not the freedom, but the slavery of the intellect and the will. "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." "Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin" (John viii. 32; v. 34).

A Catholic does not give a blind, degrading obedience to a fallible, human authority, that may ask him to believe without question the most preposterous statements, but a divine authority, that can neither deceive him nor be deceived. "The testimony of God is greater than the testimony of men," says St. John (1 John v. 9). He is not hampered in his search for truth, but like the true scientist, builds upon facts and principles he already knows.

Infallibility is the corrective of error in matters of belief, conduct and worship. "It is," as Cardinal Newman says, "a supply for a need, and it does not go beyond the need. Its object is, and its effect also, not to enfeeble the freedom or vigor of human thought, but to resist and control its extravagances" (*Apologia,* 253). It is like the compass on the modern ocean liner or aëroplane, that points out the true course in the darkness and in the fog.

"What is this freedom of thought?" asks Dr. Vance. "Thought means conception, judgment, reasoning. Conception is as determined as sensation; judgment, if it is to have any validity, must follow fixed canons; reasoning, if it is not to be chaotic and fallacious, is tied to certain well-defined standard forms and methods. The scope of the so-called "freedom of thought" is thus severely limited. To think freely is to judge at random, or to reason incorrectly. It can only be dictated by caprice or ignorance, by an overmastering prejudice which it would be vicious to encourage, or by a disingenuousness which it would be almost criminal not to suppress" (*Freedom of Thought,* 10).

A prejudiced Protestant may have a false conception of the meaning of an indulgence, or of Papal infallibility; his ignorance of Latin may make him believe that the Jesuits teach that the end justifies the means; his fallacious reasoning may convince him that a Catholic owes civil allegiance to a foreign power, or

that birth control is not against the divine law. But he certainly is not to be praised for believing what is not true. We call such freedom of thought error and ignorance. It is unreasonable, unscientific and contrary to the evidence.

The same holds good of the modern unbeliever who, without even considering the evidence, declares Original Sin a fable, a supernatural revelation absurd, the Gospels myths, all miracles impossible, and Christ Jesus a mere man. It would certainly be more scientific and more reasonable, if he would set aside these *a priori,* gratuitous assumptions, and weigh carefully the solid evidences of Christianity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Donat, *The Freedom of Science.*

Do not converts to your infallible Church have to surrender their reason? Is not your Church a spiritual despotism?

No, the Catholic faith is most reasonable, for the ultimate authority on which we believe is the voice of God speaking to us through the Church. As Dr. Brownson says: "It is not the Church that establishes spiritual despotism; it is she who saves us from it. Spiritual despotism is that which subjects us in spiritual matters to a human authority, whether our own or that of others; and the only redemption from it is having in them a divine authority. Protestants themselves acknowledge this when they call out for the pure word of God. The Church teaches by divine authority; in submitting to her we submit to God, and are freed from all human authority. She teaches infallibly; therefore, in believing what she teaches, we believe the truth, which frees us from falsehood and error, to which all men without an infallible guide are subject, and submission to which is the elemental principle of all spiritual despotism" (*Works,* x., 128).

Brownson's friend, Father Hecker, the founder of the Paulist Fathers, thus answers our questioner: "It was one of the happiest moments of our life, when we discovered for the first time, that it was not required of us to abandon our reason, or to drown it in a false excitement to be a religious man. That to become a Catholic, so far from being contrary to reason, was a supreme act of reason" (*Questions of the Soul,* 286; *Cf. Aspirations of Nature,* chs. xxiii., xxiv.).

The strange notion that converts are always in perpetual warfare with their own reason is thus dismissed by Cardinal Newman: "It is no difficult thing for a Catholic to believe; it is not without an effort, a miserable effort, that anyone who has received that gift, unlearns to believe. He does violence to his mind, not in exercising, but in withholding his faith. When objections occur to him, which they may easily do if he lives in the

world, they are as odious and as unwelcome to him as impure thoughts are to the virtuous. He does certainly shrink from them, he flings them away from him, but why? Not in the first instance, because they are dangerous, but because they are cruel and base. His loving Lord has done everything for him, and has He deserved such a return?" (*Discourses to Mixed Congregations,* 223.)

I might cite the evidence of hundreds of converts who give the same testimony regarding the freedom a Catholic enjoys. Father Ronald Knox writes in his *Spiritual Æneid:* "I had been encouraged to suppose, and finally prepared to find, that the immediate result of submission to Rome would be the sense of having one's liberty cramped and restricted in a number of ways, necessary no doubt to the welfare of the Church at large, but galling to the individual. . . . The curious thing is that my experience has been exactly the opposite. I have been overwhelmed with the feeling of liberty—the glorious liberty of the sons of God. . . . It was not until I became a Catholic that I became conscious of my former homelessness, my exile from the place that was my own" (*Ibid.,* 247, 249).

Dr. Kinsman, one time Protestant Bishop of Wilmington, writes in the same strain: "My attitude towards the Church is one of entire submission. 'Crucifixion of the intellect,' some object. I should call it 'resurrection,' but so long as I experience the fact, I shall not quarrel about the word. My chief consciousness as a Catholic is a new freedom. Cardinal Gibbons, in a little address to me, said that in spite of 'exterior hardships,' which he knew I must encounter, he hoped that I might enjoy 'interior sunshine.' That I think expresses what has been given" (*Salve Mater,* xiii.).

Did not Luther, in his bold protest against the Catholic Church, uphold the rights of reason?

On the contrary no one ever rated reason so low as Luther, who believed that original sin meant the utter corruption of human nature. He told his followers at Wittenberg that they must hate reason as their greatest foe. He frequently called reason "the devil's whore"; "the arch-enemy of the faith"; "a crazy witch," on whom the heathen hung when they thought themselves cleverest. The incomprehensibility of the mysteries of faith, for the understanding of which reason alone does not suffice, Luther represents as an open contradiction to reason. To him reason and philosophy are necessarily opposed to God. Harnack says on this point: "Luther conceived a distrust of reason itself, not to be explained simply by his distrust of it, as the main prop of self-righteousness. . . . No one can despise reason with impunity, and Luther himself was punished by the

darkening of his own views on faith" (Grisar, *Luther*, i., 158; iii., 21; v., 4; vi., 365).

How different the Catholic teaching, which holds, that although Original Sin weakened our natural faculties, it did not destroy man's reason or free will.

Pius IX, in his Letter to the Austrian Bishops, calls reason "the most distinguished gift of heaven." The Church regards it as a sure guide of the unbeliever to the faith. If man's individual reason could not acquire certitude of the preambula of faith such as the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, the freedom of the will and the like, nor accept the motives of credibility, the Catholic Church would appeal in vain to an unbelieving world.

Faith is not opposed to reason as Luther maintained, for it is, as St. Paul says, "a reasonable service" (Rom. xii. 1).

Does not the Catholic Church hinder the direct relationship of the soul to God? Your saint worship is a proof.

No, on the contrary, her sole aim is to bring souls into intimate union with God, by having them participate in the redeeming work of Jesus Christ on the Cross,—chiefly by the Mass and the Sacraments.

The Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, alone has the Mass, which renews every day upon our altars the Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross. It is "a propitiatory Sacrifice," as the Council of Trent teaches (Sess. xii., can. 3), "whereby God grants grace and the gift of repentance, and remits crimes and even the greatest sins" (*Ibid.*, ch. 2).

By Baptism a Catholic is united to Christ as the Branch is united to the vine (John xv. 1-7); faith, hope and charity are infused into our souls (Trent, Sess. vi., ch. 7), so that we become "partakers of the Divine Nature" (2 Peter i. 4), and are given "the adoption of sons" (Gal. iv. 4-7; Rom. viii. 14-17). If, committing grievous sin, we lose the grace of God, the Church gives us a chance to regain it by means of the Sacrament of Penance. Through Holy Communion the Catholic is most intimately united with Christ, according to His promise: "He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood, abideth in Me and I in him" (John vi. 57).

The veneration that Catholics pay to the Blessed Virgin and the saints brings us closer to Christ, if we but imitate their virtues. With the Mother of God they say to us: "Whatsoever He shall say to you, do ye"; and with St. Paul: "Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ" (John ii. 5; 1 Cor. xi. 2).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Adam, *The Spirit of Catholicism*, vii.

Does not the Catholic Church insist upon an outward uniformity with her laws rather than upon fidelity to conscience? Did not Luther reinstate conscience in its rights?

No, we answer to both questions. Conscience is a dictate of the practical reason, deciding that a particular action is right or wrong. It is the voice or ambassador of God, making known to us His eternal law, and applying it in our every day life. Pope Innocent III taught plainly: "Whatever is done contrary to conscience leads to hell" (*Decret.*, Lib. ii., tit. 3, ch. 3).

The Catholic Church has always taught that conscience, the authoritative guide of our moral conduct, requires us to submit to all properly constituted authority, especially to the divine authority of Christ's Church. Luther, by substituting fallible private judgment for the infallible common judgment of the Church in matters of faith and morals, left conscience to itself, or referred it to his own teaching, *i. e.*, his peculiar interpretation of the Scriptures. Mere subjectivism became the guide of himself and his followers. He could allow lies of convenience, counsel monks, nuns and Teutonic Knights to break their vows, and countenance the bigamy of the Landgrave of Hesse—all in the name of conscience (Grisar, *Luther,* iv., 108; v., 66-78). His descendants to-day in like manner defend the evils of divorce and birth control in the name of conscience.

The Church does not usurp the office of the individual conscience, but refers it to the divine tradition of faith and morals, taught by Jesus and the twelve Apostles. She has never been content with mere formalism or "an outward holiness by works," as Luther styled it, but has always insisted upon the virtues of faith, hope, love of God and the neighbor, urging men to live a supernatural, interior life of grace. Her priests in the confessional are educators of conscience, bringing it in accord with the eternal law, when it has become lax, scrupulous or erroneous.

If, as you pretend, the claims of your Church are so strong, why is it that so many intelligent non-Catholics fail to see their force?

The reason is that they have never considered the claims of the Church in their entirety, or, if they have studied them fairly well, they have approached the study with minds full of prejudice and hearts full of sin. In the last thirty-three years of my priesthood I have asked many an inquirer to devote at least a half hour a day for a year to a study of the Church's teaching, praying earnestly in the meanwhile for God's grace and guidance. All who faithfully followed this advice received

the gift of faith in the end. Even when the journey home lasted from three to five years—the first year's study and prayer made the final victory possible.

More people are kept out of the Catholic Church by prejudice than by intellectual difficulties. The Jews, who were looking for a political Messias, found it hard to accept the meek and humble Jesus, who was continually prophesying His Death upon the Cross. They might admit His miracles, but they denied their proving power, ascribing them to the devil (Matt. xii. 24; xvi. 21). The same prejudice against the supernatural will make a rationalist to-day admit as a fact a well-authenticated miracle at Lourdes, but negative its proving power by ascribing it to some unknown law of nature. A Methodist or Baptist of Mississippi or Alabama, who has been taught from childhood by parents whom he loves, and by teachers and friends whom he respects, that the Catholic Church is an unreasonable, unscientific, unscriptural, superstitious, intolerant, and foreign system of priestly imposture, must fight valiantly the prejudices of a lifetime, before he can weigh carefully the divine claims of Catholicism.

Our Lord and His Apostles tell us that worldliness and sensuality frequently blind men's minds to the light of truth. "The world has not known Thee, just Father," says Christ. "The sensual man," says St. Paul, "perceiveth not those things that are of the Spirit of God; for it is foolishness to him, and he cannot understand" (John xvii. 25; *Cf.* xv. 19; 1 Cor. ii. 14). Even fairly good living people at times find it difficult to see the force of the Catholic claims, because they realize that conversion will mean for them the loss of an inheritance, the estrangement of relatives and friends, and the blighting of their political prospects.

On the other hand, however, Catholics can point to the thousands of converts who are coming to the Catholic Church every year from paganism, unbelief and Protestantism, at the cost of sacrifices that often amount to a practical martyrdom. We recommend our questioner to read the adventures of some of these spiritual pilgrims on their road to the City of Peace. We mention a few of them: Allies, *A Life's Decision;* Baker, *A Modern Pilgrim's Progress;* Benson, *The Confessions of a Convert;* Burnett, *The Path Which Led a Protestant Lawyer to the Church;* Kinsman, *Salve Mater;* James, *The Adventures of a Spiritual Tramp;* Knox, *A Spiritual Æneid;* Lawrence, *The Journey Home;* Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua;* Psichari, *A Soldier's Pilgrimage;* Raupert, *Back to Rome;* Richards, *A Loyal Life;* Von Ruville, *Back to Holy Church;* Scrutator, *Back to Rome;* Stoddard, *A Troubled Heart; Rebuilding a Lost Faith;* Stone, *An Awakening;* Viator, *From Geneva to Rome;* Williams,

The High Romance; Curtis, *Roads to Rome in America; Beyond the Road to Rome;* Mannix, *The American Convert Movement;* O'Neill, *Converts to Rome in America; Stories of Conversions.*

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH

What do Catholics mean by unity? Is not the so-called unity of your Church a veneer, impossible to realize, considering the claims of reason to think for itself?

Catholics, taught by Christ, and the divine tradition handed down from the beginning of Christianity, believe that the Catholic Church alone possesses a unity of divine government, divine faith and divine worship.

Jesus Christ never spoke of a plurality of Churches, but of "My Church," when He first promised Peter, chief Apostle, that He would make him the rock foundation of the divine Society He was about to establish. When He referred to the Kingdom of God prophesied in the Old Testament, He called it the kingdom of heaven, the city on the hill, the net containing good and bad fishes, the field of the wheat and the tares, the pearl of great price, the one fold of the One Shepherd. The Church is always pictured in the New Testament as visibly one, presided over by the shepherd Peter, who represents Christ, the Good Shepherd, a kingdom of God, telling all men until the last day to *believe* only what He and His Apostles taught, to *obey* His and their commands, to *worship* as He ordered (Matt. xvi. iii. 24; v. 14; xiii. 47, 24, 25; John x. 16; xxi. 17).

Christ plainly foretold that the gates of hell would never prevail against His Church, and that He would provide for its unity by His abiding presence, and the power of the Holy Spirit. For "every kingdom divided against itself shall be brought to desolation, and house against house shall fall" (Luke xi. 17). We readily grant that the private judgment of the individual, and the selfish nationalism of the nations would *naturally* bring about disunion in the Church, but the Divine Builder ensured its unity by a special *supernatural* grace, which He asked of His Heavenly Father the night before He died. There can be no doubt of the meaning of our Lord's prayer: "That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me and I in Thee; that they also may be one in Us . . . and the glory which Thou hast given Me, I have given to them; that they may be one, as We also are One" (John xvii. 21, 22). The unity Christ prays for is to be the most striking mark of His true Church, for it is founded on

the mutual love of Father and Son in the unity of the Most Blessed Trinity.

The early Christians are mentioned as "persevering in one mind in prayer" and "breaking bread from house to house" (Acts i. 14; ii. 46; *Cf.* v. 12); the Council of Jerusalem is convoked because of schism (Acts xv. 24); the first deacons are ordained because of the lack of unity between the Greeks and Hebrews (Acts vi. 1-5). St. Peter has the unity of the Church in mind when he has an Apostle chosen in the place of the apostate Judas (Acts i. 15-26), when he defends against the Judaizers the baptism of Cornelius (Acts xi. 1-18), and when he declares the Jewish laws no longer binding on the Gentiles (Acts xv. 6-30).

St. Paul insists upon the unity of the Church in his every Epistle. Although he mentions individual local churches in certain cities (Col. iv. 15, 16), he teaches clearly that they are parts of the one Church in every place (1 Thess. i. 8; 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. ii. 14). The Church is not a mere organization that may divide and subdivide like a nation or a club, but a divine organism with its own inherent principle of life. It is Christ's Mystical Body, of which He is the Head and all Christians the members. It is founded by *One* Lord, animated by *One* Spirit, entered into by *one* Baptism, ruled by a *united* episcopate, and having *one* aim, the glory of God and the salvation of men's souls (Acts x. 28; Rom. xii. 4-8; 1 Cor. xii. 12-27; Eph. iv. 3-16).

"For as the body is one, and hath many members; and all the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body; so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free. . . . You are the body of Christ, and members of member" (1 Cor. xii. 12-27). "Careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. One body and one Spirit; as you are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, one Baptism, One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all. . . . And He gave some Apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; until we all meet in the unity of faith . . . that henceforth we be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness, by which they lie in wait to deceive" (Eph. iv. 3-14).

The "comprehensiveness" of which some modern Christians boast is clearly negatived by the Apostle. We are not free to deny in any one point the "sacred deposit of sound doctrine" (1 Tim. i. 10, 11; vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 13, 14), but are "to avoid the profane novelties of words, and oppositions of knowledge

falsely so-called," and "to shun those who have erred from the truth, and have subverted the faith" (1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. ii. 16-18). We must ever "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints" (Jude i. 3) and pronounce anathema even upon an angel, who would dare teach an alien gospel (Gal. i. 8-12).

St. Irenæus thus writes of the Church's unity of faith, and her horror of schism. "The Church, having received the Apostolic teaching and faith, though spread over the whole world, guards it seduously, as though dwelling in one house; and these truths she uniformly teaches, as having but one soul and one heart; these truths she proclaims, teaches and hands down as though she had but one mouth. For although men of different nations speak in diverse tongues, still the import of the tradition is one and the same." . . . "Those who cause schism rend and divide the great and glorious Body of Christ, and so, far as they can, they destroy it, speaking peace but in reality waging war against it" (*Adv. Hær.*, I., x., 2; IV., xxxiii., 7).

We often hear non-Catholics say that men are free to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience. No one who grasps the full meaning of Christ's words can believe this. Our Lord told the Apostles to "baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," and said: "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (Matt. xxviii. 19; John iii. 5). He said again that we must partake of His Body and Blood to have divine life. "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you" (John vi. 54). The Mass, the clean oblation foretold by the prophet Malachias (i. 11), He instituted the night before He died, saying: "This is My Body. This is My Blood. Do this for a commemoration of Me" (Matt. xxvi. 26-28; Luke xxii. 19).

The necessity of unity in the use of the other Sacraments is clear, once we realize that they were instituted by Christ to apply to our souls the merits of His Redemption; *viz.*, Confirmation to strengthen our faith, Penance to pardon our sins, Extreme Unction to prepare us for death, Marriage to sanctify the union of man and wife, and Holy Orders to enable the priesthood to pardon sin and to offer Sacrifice.

The Catholic Church is distinguished from all other churches by the mark of unity. The churches that are in communion with the See of Rome are all agreed in matters of faith. Ask any Catholic bishop or priest the world over to explain any Catholic doctrine, and he will give you substantially the same answer. "Mere tradition will not account for it; for human traditions vary, and tend to become contradictory, especially as they spread. Mere authority will not account for it, or written declarations or decrees. For why should so many millions freely

and gladly submit to this authority, and as freely and gladly reverence and obey these decrees. There must be some guiding Spirit, which animates the whole, and inspires alike teachers and taught. A complex organism can remain one only so long as there is a vital force within it" (Walker, *The Problem of Reunion,* 232). The same holds good for worship. In every Catholic church in the world the same Mass is offered daily, and the same seven Sacraments administered to the people. That unity of faith and worship are safeguarded by the Pope, who rules the whole flock in Christ's name and with His authority is admitted even by non-Catholics who have declared: "We have in the Roman Catholic Church a realized ideal of unity" (C. H. Matthews, *Faith or Fear,* 190).

Bibliography: Berry, *The Church of Christ;* Hugueney, *Catholicism and Criticism,* viii.; Lattey (ed.), *The Church;* Mathew (ed.), *Ecclesia, the Church of Christ;* Poulpiquet, *L'Eglise Catholique;* Walker, *The Problem of Reunion.* C. W. ci. 181.

THE BRANCH THEORY

Is not the universal Church one, inasmuch as it is made up of the Roman, Anglican and Eastern Churches, which are entirely independent, yet bound together as branches of the one Church?

By no means. This Branch Theory held by certain members of the High Church party of the Church of England is a visionary, illogical, incoherent theory, repudiated alike by both Rome and Constantinople, and possessing not the slightest warrant either in the Sacred Scriptures or in the writings of the Fathers.

Our Savior indeed uses the symbol of Christians as branches in a vine, but they are branches joined to each other visibly and really by their common life in the trunk, which is Christ the Lord. It is a symbol of UNITED branches. The schismatic, or separated branch, as Christ says, "shall be cast forth as a branch and shall wither, and they shall gather him up, and cast him into the fire, and he burneth" (John xv. 6).

According to the Fathers of the Church, who frequently discuss the point, a schism is not merely "an unfortunate misunderstanding" among Christians, but "an invention of the devil," as St. Cyprian calls it (*The Unity of the Church*), implying a real breach of intercommunion and "a stealing of men from the Church." That a man could separate from the Church and at the same time be a Catholic, was to them inconceivable (Chapman, *Bishop Gore and the Catholic Claims,* ch. vii.).

One can easily understand the Catholic position. There is one visible Church in communion with herself the world over,

forming one universal divine Society under the Pope. One can understand the Protestant theory: there is no visible Church, but everyone is a Christian or a Catholic who follows Christ. But this compromise opinion of a union of utterly antagonistic bodies cannot be understood nor satisfactorily explained.

Moreover this theory supposes, contrary to facts, that there is one great Eastern Church, united in the same primitive faith, that ever agreed in denying the Papal claims. This is a mere figment of the imagination. No such body ever existed. The East has been from the beginning, and it is to-day, full of heresies and schisms. Besides the sixteen branches of the Eastern Orthodox Church (Fortescue, *The Orthodox Eastern Church,* 273), there are other Eastern Churches, the Nestorian, the Coptic, the Jacobite, and the Armenian, who are no more in communion with her than with us Catholics. The Orthodox regard them as heretics and schismatics. Do our Anglican friends regard them as real branches? How can they do so in the face of the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon?

When we mention the Church of England, what do we mean? What are its doctrines? What are its laws? What is its worship? Every sort of answer will be given the inquirer from the ultra-liberal views of a Bishop Barnes or a Bishop Henson to the ultra anti-Catholic Kensitites. No one part can honestly claim to speak for the whole body, which is a "comprehensive" medley of the most divergent opinions.

When you ask an Anglican how do you prove that your Church is a true branch of the Church Catholic, he will answer that two things are required: Valid orders and the Creeds. But we ask why valid orders rather than the Papacy or the Mass? Does he forget that the Church Catholic has declared Anglican orders invalid?

As for the Creeds, they are not in the slightest degree helpful. The Apostles' Creed is unknown to any Eastern Church. The Athanasian Creed has no authority in the East, nor has it the authority of any General Council in the West. The Nicene Creed is indeed accepted by General Councils, and acknowledged by both East and West. But what of the Filioque clause? The Orthodox call us Catholics heretics, because we inserted these words in the Creed. It follows, therefore, that no Creed can be a test of the validity of the branch theory.

In a word the terms Catholic and schismatic are mutually exclusive. Some Anglicans seem to realize this at times, when they speak of the Catholic Church in England as "The Italian Mission." This ridiculous assertion may make the judicious grieve, but it proves that some Anglicans have some grasp of logic, if they have no sense of humor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Fortescue, *The Branch Theory*

THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCH

What are the differences between the Orthodox Eastern Church and the Catholic Church?

The Orthodox Eastern Church, numbering about 94,000,000, consists of sixteen independent Churches, over which the Patriarch of Constantinople has a jurisdiction of honor. Before the schism there were but five patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem and the Church of Cyprus. Since the schism each politically independent State has its own Church, *viz.,* Russia, Greece, Serbia, Montenegro, Roumania and Bulgaria. Mount Sinai is an independent Church, and there are four in what was once the Austrian Empire. The revolution has played sad havoc with the Church in Russia, which has been split up into many divisions under the Soviets' rule.

The bishops are all celibates, but the secular clergy may marry before ordination. The ecumenical Patriarch is the head of the Orthodox hierarchy.

The Orthodox express their faith by the Creeds, the decisions of the first seven Councils, and certain confessions of faith. They believe their communion to be the only true Church of Christ, reject the primacy and infallibility of the Pope, and teach that the Holy Ghost proceeds from God the Father alone. They believe in an objective Real Presence of our Lord in the Blessed Eucharist, but believe that the change takes place not at the words of consecration as we do, but at the invocation of the Holy Ghost (*Epiklesis*), which follow them in the Mass. They deny Purgatory in the sense of a cleansing fire, while praying for the dead. They deny the Immaculate Conception, especially since its definition by the Pope.

The Orthodox always baptize by immersion, administer Confirmation immediately after Baptism, give Communion under both kinds four times a year, Christmas, Easter, Whitsunday and the Feast of the Assumption, hear confessions on rare occasions, anoint both the sick and the well, allow divorce in case of adultery, ordain by laying on one hand only, etc.

The Eastern Orthodox Church is nearer to Catholicism than any other religious body. They believe in a visible Church with authority to declare the true faith; they accept all the books of the Old Testament and the New; they believe in the Mass and the priesthood; they believe in seven Sacraments; they honor and pray to the saints and to the Blessed Virgin

Besides the Orthodox Church there are the Lesser Eastern Churches, *i. e.,* the Coptic, Jacobite, Nestorian and Armenian, which all sprang from the two great heresies of the fifth century, Nestorianism, condemned at Ephesus in 431, and Mono-

physitism, condemned at Chalcedon in 451 (*Cf.* Fortescue, *The Lesser Eastern Churches*).

At various times in Church history members of these three main classes of Eastern Churches, the Orthodox, the Nestorians and the Monophysites, have repented of their schism, and joined again the true Church. These are known as Uniates. They number about six million souls, and are divided as follows: Greeks, Italo-Greeks, Georgians, Melchites, Ruthenians, Serbians, Bulgarians and Roumanians.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Fortescue, *The Orthodox Eastern Church;* Jugie, *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium;* Janin, *Les Eglises Orientales.*

What was the origin of the schism between the Orthodox Eastern Church and Rome?

On the death of Methodius, Patriarch of Constantinople, in 842, all the Orthodox Eastern Churches were in communion with Rome. Ignatius, the son of the deposed Emperor, Michael I, succeeded him, and his election was confirmed by Pope Gregory IV (827-844). The Empress Theodora retired in 856, and her brother Bardas ruled as regent over the Byzantine Empire in the place of her profligate young son, Michael the Drunkard (842-867). They deposed Ignatius because he refused to give communion to Bardas, who was living in open incest with his daughter-in-law, and because he refused to put Theodora in a nunnery against her will. The scholarly but unscruplous Secretary of State, Photius, was hurried through all the necessary orders in six days contrary to the canons, and then consecrated Patriarch by the excommunicated Archbishop of Syracuse, Gregory.

Both Ignatius and Photius appealed to the Pope. At first the Papal legates sent to Constantinople confirmed the deposition of Ignatius. But Pope Nicholas, after ascertaining the true facts in the case, deprived both legates of their Bishoprics for bribery, and excommunicated Photius. Photius answered by striking the Pope's name off the diptychs, which meant open schism. In 867 Photius published a letter against the Pope and the Latins, making five accusations, the chief being that the West had added the Filioque clause to the Creed.

Basil, the Imperial Equerry, who became Emperor in 867 after murdering both Bardas and Michael, at once deposed Photius because of his connections with the Imperial family, and restored Ignatius to his see. In 869 the Eighth General Council, which excommunicated Photius, was held in Constantinople, and confirmed the election of Ignatius.

On the death of the rightful Patriarch, Photius was made his successor, because he was astute enough to have forged for the

Emperor a mythical pedigree going back to King Tiridates of the noble house of the Arsacides. This election was confirmed by Pope John VIII (872-882). In a second synod held in Constantinople in 879, Photius denounced the Pope and the Latins, and was again excommunicated by John VIII. In 886, Leo VI (886-912), who had succeeded his father, deposed Photius for treason, and banished him from Constantinople. He died in exile in 891. After his death the union between East and West was restored for nearly one hundred and fifty years, although there always remained an anti-Papal party in Constantinople, which shared the ideas of Photius, and regarded him as a national hero.

The final break of the East with Rome occurred in 1053, when the Patriarch, Michael Cerularius (1043-1058), denounced the Latins for consecrating unleavened bread, fasting on Saturdays, and advocating the celibacy of the clergy. He closed the Latin churches and monasteries in Constantinople, and, when rebuked by Pope Leo IX (1049-1054), took the Pope's name from the diptychs, thus openly professing schism. The Papal legates then excommunicated him, placing their bull on the altar of the Church of Sancta Sophia, July 16, 1054.

Since the schism of the eleventh century the Bishops of the East and West have come together only three times to discuss their differences. First at Bari under Pope Urban II (1098), when St. Anselm of Canterbury ably defended the Filioque. A second time at the Second General Council of Lyons under Pope Gregory X (1274), and a third time at the Council of Florence under Pope Eugenius III (1439). In these Councils the Easterns accepted the Church's teaching on every point, but they acted purely on political motives, hoping in each case to obtain help from the West against the Moslem. When this was not forthcoming, they repudiated the Councils.

The first reunion between East and West lasted eight years, until the Emperor Michael Palæologus struck the name of the Pope from the diptychs. The second reunion lasted only four years, the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem withdrawing their assent to the conciliar decrees in 1443.

The Eastern schism has lasted nearly five hundred years. Is there any hope of reunion? If one reads the insulting answer sent by Anthimos VII of Constantinople to Pope Leo XIII's kindly and warm appeal for the Easterns to return to the Church of their Fathers (Encyclical, *Præclara*), one cannot be very hopeful (Duchesne, *Churches Separated from Rome*). But the late bitter persecution of the Russian Orthodox Church by the Bolsheviks, and the great charity manifested by the Pope in their day of trial may in the long run lead many Easterns to a study of their early Fathers, who acknowledged clearly the supremacy of

Peter's See. Pope Benedict XV founded the Oriental Institute with reunion in mind, and our present Holy Father, Pius XI, has asked the Easterns "to put aside their old prejudices, and strive to understand the true life of the Church," while at the same time he urges Catholics to "beseech God with devout and earnest prayers" for their return to the one fold of the One Shepherd (*Encyclical on St. Josaphat, Martyr*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Alzog, *The History of the Church,* ii., 450-466, 605, 931, 946; Bousquet, *Unité de l'Eglise et le Schisme Grec;* Fortescue, *The Orthodox Eastern Church;* Mourret, *Histoire Generale de l'Eglise,* iii., iv., v. A. Q. 1894, 691.

Is there not a great difference between the faith of a learned and the faith of an ignorant Catholic?

No there is not. The trained theologian or apologist may know more facts, and have a greater grasp of the principles of philosophy or theology, but his faith is identical with the faith of the most illiterate peasant. Both believe the same Gospel of Christ in its entirety, and for the same reason, *viz.*, the authority of God, witnessed unto them by the divine, infallible teaching of Christ's one true Church.

DEVELOPMENT

You claim to have always taught the same doctrines. Why I remember myself two new teachings of your Church in recent times, viz., the Immaculate Conception and the Infallibility of the Pope, declared only in 1854 and 1870. Can the Catholic Church impose as many Creeds as she pleases? Are not all the doctrines of Christianity contained in the Apostles' Creed? Is it not enough to hold the teachings of the first Councils of the Church?

The Catholic Church teaches clearly that after the death of St. John there has been no objective increase in the deposit of faith, but that there has been progress and development in our understanding of it.

Christ plainly taught that the Apostles were to preach "all that He commanded" (Matt. xxviii. 20), and St. Paul insists repeatedly upon the unchanging character of the Gospel, and the utter impossibility of any new teaching being of Christ (Gal. i. 6; 1 Tim. vi. 29; 2 Tim. i. 13, 14; ii. 2; Heb. viii. 7; xii. 27, 28; vii. 11).

The Vatican Council says: "For the Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter, that by His revelation they might make known NEW doctrine, but that by His assistance they might inviolably keep and faithfully expound the revelation or deposit of faith delivered through the Apostles" (Sess. iv., ch. iv.).

The Catholic Church is Christ's Mystical Body, as the Sacred Scriptures teach (2 Cor. xii. 27; Col. i. 13; Rom. vi. 5), animated by a life-giving soul, which is Christ's Holy Spirit (St. Augustine, Ser. 267). Life everywhere manifests growth and development. The living Church, therefore, must always manifest a constantly expanding growth and a corresponding internal development. The Gospel was not given to us in the Bible alone as a series of clearly defined theses in a theological textbook, but was set forth in various narratives and discourses as occasion demanded. Not everything was written in the Bible, as St. Paul plainly teaches (2 Thess. ii. 14).

From the very beginning men endeavored to read their own heretical opinions into the pages of the Sacred Scriptures, and in this way they gave the world many false teachings regarding the Trinity, the Incarnation, Original Sin, and the like.

The Church, as the divine teacher of revelation, declared clearly the true doctrine, and condemned every false opinion that contradicted it. This could only be done by defining the true doctrine in clearer and more definite terms, as each varying heresy arose within her fold. In this consists the development of doctrine.

Did men claim, for example, that the Son of God was a mere creature? (Arius.) She proclaims the Divinity of the Word made Flesh (Nicæa, 325). Did men claim that Christ was two distinct Persons, the Divine and the Human? (Nestorius.) She declares that He was one Divine Person (Ephesus, 431). Did men claim that the Human Nature had been absorbed into the Divine? (Eutyches.) She asserts that Christ possessed both a Human and a Divine Nature, "not confused, changed, divided or separated" (Chalcedon, 431). In the sixteenth century, when the Reformers in England and on the continent maintained false views about the Bible, Divine Tradition, the Mass and the Sacraments, the Church, as the divine guardian of the revelation of God, condemned their errors, and set forth accurately the true doctrine.

It would be impossible to name a single doctrine of the Church which has not been denied by some heretical body. Indeed even among the Fathers of the Church, before certain doctrines were defined, you come across loosely worded, inaccurate and even erroneous expressions. The heretic is one who even after the Church has spoken and defined clearly the disputed

doctrine, contumaciously defends his error. In many a Catholic book you will find the author prefacing his thesis on a question still left undecided by the Church with the words: "I submit everything herein written to the judgment of Holy Mother Church."

When the Church defines a doctrine she does not create a new teaching. She simply declares infallibly that this belief is part of the original revelation taught by Jesus Christ and the twelve Apostles. Before this official declaration the dogma was implicitly but not explicitly believed by all Christians. A comparison may make this clear.

If by a new, powerful telescope I discover a new planet in the heavens, I do not create that planet. I simply add a new fact to the general stock of astronomical knowledge. Whereas men may have questioned its existence before my discovery, they are now no longer free to deny it.

The doctrine of development is taught by our Lord in the parable of the mustard seed (Matt. xiii. 31), and in His teaching about the guidance of the Holy Spirit (John xiv. 26; xvi. 13). St. Paul elaborates it in his letter to the Ephesians (iv. 11-16). He represents the Church as a living body, growing and developing, meeting every attack of heresy, yet continually progressing "in the knowledge of the Son of God."

The classic treatise on the subject is Cardinal Newman's *An Essay on Development,* which is not a new teaching as some have asserted, but a scholarly outline of the teaching of the Bible and Divine Tradition.

St. Vincent of Lerins (450), after declaring that the Apostolic doctrine must remain unchangeable in its substance, defends the teaching so ably set forth by Cardinal Newman fifteen hundred years later. He tells us that it must be a development, not a change; the progress of all and each in the understanding, science and knowledge of the revealed doctrine, but without any alteration of the previous belief. The ancient doctrines may be finished off and polished, but they must not be changed, diminished or disfigured. They are susceptible of more evidence, light and precision, but they retain their fullness, integrity and specific meaning (Com. 23).

The Creeds are precise formulas of doctrine, used to secure uniformity in teaching, and to place beyond doubt the belief of those who are admitted into the Church. The principal Creeds, the Apostles', the Athanasian and the Nicene, do not contain every Catholic doctrine. As heresies arose, the Creeds were modified, not to add new doctrines, but to express the traditional faith in terms that could not possibly be misunderstood.

It is illogical and sinful to limit the Church's teaching to the early Councils. She is a divine, infallible witness of God's

revelation until the end of the world, always ready to answer any question about the Gospel of Christ. She is a living Church.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Newman, *An Essay on Development;* Northcote, *The Doctrine of Development;* Marin-Sola, *L'Evolution Homogène du Dogme Catholique;* O'Doherty, *Doctrinal Progress;* Rickaby, *Development.* C. W. lxv. 433; lxxii. 349.—D. April, 1901.—R. A. v. 520; vi. 81, 401.—R. C. iii. 316, 516; xvii. 5; xxxiv. 40; liv. 129.

THE CHURCH AND SCIENCE

Has not your Church, by striving to maintain an absolute uniformity of belief, always been the determined enemy of science? How can you reconcile the dogmas of your Church with the findings of modern science? Have not most scientists in the past century been atheists or agnostics,—a positive proof that religion and science are incompatible?

No, the Catholic Church has never been the enemy of science, although this calumny has often been made by bitter anti-Christians, obsessed by what Father Wasmann calls "an absolute *theophobia,* a dread of the Creator" (*The Problem of Evolution,* 47), and consequently of God's Church. Dr. Walsh, in *The Popes and Science,* has ably refuted the two writers who have done their utmost to popularize this calumny in this country, *viz.,* White, *The Warfare of Science With Theology,* and Draper, *The Conflict Between Religion and Science.*

Science, in the mind of our questioner, is identified with physical science, *i. e.,* astronomy, botany, chemistry, geology, zoology and the like. Science deals with ascertained facts, which it compiles, classifies and attempts to explain by some working hypothesis, *that may or may not be true.* The Church has no quarrel with the proved facts of science, which she accepts on the authority of various specialists. She is not in the world to teach men the distance between the earth and the sun, the action of nitric or sulphuric acid, or the composition of the rocks on the earth's surface. In the name of science, however, she warns us not to accept the erroneous guesses of some scientists as positive facts. Huxley once declared a certain chemical compound to be an organized, living thing, but, when called to account, he at once acknowledged his mistake. Lesser men, as St. Augustine warns us, ought "not to make rash assertions, or to assert what is not known as known." If dissension arise, St. Augustine thus advises the theologian: "Whatever scientists demonstrate to be true, we must prove can be reconciled with

our Scriptures; and whatever they assert contrary to those Scriptures, *i. e.*, the Catholic faith, we must either prove to be false, or we must, without the slightest hesitation, believe to be true. . . . The Holy Ghost did not intend to teach men the essential nature of the things of the visible universe, things in no way profitable for salvation" (*Providentissimus Deus*).

The Vatican Council teaches plainly that the Church is not the enemy of science, and that faith cannot contradict reason. "Faith and reason are of mutual help to each other; by reason well applied, the foundations of faith are established, and in the light of faith, the science of divinity is built up. Faith, on the other hand, frees and preserves reason from error, and enriches it with knowledge. The Church, therefore, far from hindering the pursuit of the arts and sciences, fosters and promotes them in many ways. . . . Nor does she prevent sciences, each in its own sphere, from making use of their own principles and methods. Yet, while acknowledging the freedom due to them, she tries to preserve them from falling into error contrary to divine doctrine, and from overstepping their own boundaries, and throwing into confusion matters that belong to the domain of faith" (Sess. ii., ch. 4).

It is not true that the majority of nineteenth century scientists were atheists or agnostics. Eymieu in his *La Part des Croyants dans les Progrès de la Science au XIX Siècle* has listed the names of 432 scientists of mark. Setting aside 34 whose religious views are unknown, he tabulates them as follows: Atheists 16; agnostics 15; believers 367. Selecting out of this total 150 original thinkers and scientific pioneers, he finds among them only 5 atheists and 9 agnostics compared with 123 believers (the views of 13 are unknown). The German Jesuit, Father Kneller, has compiled a similar list of believing scientists in the nineteenth century (*Christianity and the Leaders of Modern Science*). He says rightly: "Even if it were true that modern scientists as one man stood out against Christ and the Church, this would offer no disproof of Christianity. . . . Materialism, atheism, and positivism are not observed facts, but systems of philosophy, inferences from facts, and inferences which fall, properly speaking, within the province not of science, but of metaphysics. With regard to conclusions of this order, the scientist is not, as such, the authoritative judge."

The late Sir Bertram Windle, a life-long student of science, has edited a series of biographies of distinguished Catholic scientists, who saw no difficulty whatever in being loyal to both natural and supernatural truth. The twelve selected are: Linacre, Vesalius, Stensen, Galvani, Laënnec, Müller, Corrigan, Secchi, Mendel, Pasteur, de Lapparent and Dwight (*Twelve Catholic Men of Science*). As Dr. Collingwood says: "These men were

not afraid of fresh discoveries, for they had faith in the Creator of all phenomena. Because they heard the voice of God in the Church, they were eager to catch every whisper of that voice in the world of nature" (*Ibid.*, 91).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Kneller, *Christianity and the Leaders of Modern Science;* Windle, *The Church and Science.* C. E. xiii.

POPE BONIFACE VIII AND DISSECTION

Did not Pope Boniface VIII forbid dissection, thus manifesting the Church's opposition to the advance of medical science?

No, Pope Boniface VIII (1294-1303) in his Bull on Burials, issued in 1302, did not prohibit dissection for medical purposes, but legislated against a barbarous custom of the crusading nobles, who, dying in foreign lands, were anxious to be buried in their native land. "The custom," says the Pope, "consists of disemboweling and dismembering the corpse, or chopping it to pieces and then boiling it, so as to remove the flesh before sending the bones home for burial." The bodies of Louis IX of France, and of the German Emperor, Frederick Barbarossa, had been shipped home in this way, and the practice had become prevalent towards the close of the thirteenth century. The Pope stigmatized this custom as "revolting" and "abominable," and forbade it henceforth under penalty of excommunication (*Extravagantes,* iii., ch. 1).

This law in no way hindered the practice of dissection, which was prevalent all throughout the fourteenth century in the medical schools of Venice, Pisa, Naples, Bologna, Florence, Rome, Montpelier and Paris (Walsh, *The Popes and Science,* 28-88).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Long, *A History of Pathology,* 46.

POPE CALIXTUS III AND HALLEY'S COMET

Did not Pope Calixtus III in 1456 issue a Bull against Halley's comet, which caused great terror during the Battle of Belgrade?

No, there is no record of any such Bull. This legend was invented by Laplace (*Reseau Philosophique*), who later on acknowledged that it had no foundation in fact. Nevertheless it has been repeated in various forms by Arago, Smyth, Grant, Flam-

marion, Babinet, Daru, Chambers, Draper, White and others. The Pope is portrayed as excommunicating, exorcising, anathematizing, cursing and conjuring away the comet, and Draper pictures the Pope attempting to scare the comet away by the ringing of church bells. The Bull of June 29, 1456, does not even mention the comet, but asks the prayers of the Christian peoples against the Turks. The bells that were rung in every church as for the Angelus were merely a call to prayer, the people reciting three Our Fathers and three Hail Marys for the triumph of Hunyadi and St. John Capistran (Pastor, *History of the Popes,* ii., 400).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Steuer, *Calixte et la Comète de Halley.* D. A. ii. 437.—M. Feb., 1907.—R. S. xvi. 670, 695.

FUNDAMENTAL AND NON-FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES

Are not all Christians agreed on essentials? I believe in accepting the fundamental teachings of Christ, and setting aside the petty details of dogma.

This distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines was invented by Jurieu (*Le Vrai Système de l'Eglise*), to offset the evident lack of unity in the Protestant churches in government, doctrine and worship. It has no scriptural warrant; it is not mentioned even once in Christian tradition. Indeed its supporters could not agree among themselves either on the criteria required, or on the doctrines to be accepted.

St. Augustine in the fifth century answered this objection in his controversy with the Donatists of North Africa. He writes: "Both of us have Baptism, in that we are united. We have the same Gospel; in this we are united. They celebrate with us the feasts of martyrs; in this we also agree. . . . But THEY ARE NOT WITH US IN ALL THINGS. They are not with us in their schism; they do not agree with us in their heresy. And by reason of those few things in which they are not with us, the many things on which they are avail them nothing" (*The Unity of the Church,* ch. iii.).

RELIGIOUS ORDERS NOT SECTS

Are there not many divisions and sects in the Catholic Church such as the Franciscans, the Dominicans, the Jesuits?

No, the religious orders of the Catholic Church are not, like the denominations of Protestantism, separatist churches.

with creeds of their own devising. They are bodies of men that have arisen at different ages of Church history to give men the example of a particular virtue like the poverty of the Franciscan or the obedience of the Jesuit, and while living the life of the counsels of Christ, to carry on a special work of charity, education, or missionary activity. Every order believes in every teaching of the Catholic faith; they differ only in matters of opinion, wherein every Catholic is free. As Cardinal Newman says: "Augustinian, Dominicans, Franciscans, Jesuits and Carmelites, have indeed their respective homes and schools, but they have, in spite of all that, a common school and a common home in their Mother's bosom; . . . but Protestants agree to differ. Quarrels, stopping short of divisions, but prove the strength of combination; they are the token, not of the languor, but of the vigor of its life. . . . The doctrines of faith are the common basis of the combatants, the ground on which they contend, their ultimate authority, and their arbitrating rule" (*Difficulties of Anglicans,* i., 261).

THE BOND OF CHARITY

Is not the "bond of charity" (John xiii. 34, 35) sufficient to unite men in the fellowship of Christ, without our bothering about dogmas and creeds?

No, it is not, for St. Paul declares that "without faith it is impossible to please God" (Heb. xi. 6), and he always bases love on the unity of faith. He writes: "Careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. One body and one Spirit; as you are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph. iv. 3, 6). "Be of one mind, having the same charity, being of one accord, agreeing in sentiment" (Phil. ii. 2).

Our Lord, who tells us to love our neighbor to prove our true discipleship, also says: "He that believeth not, shall be condemned" (Mark xvi. 16).

THE GREAT WESTERN SCHISM (1378-1417)

Was not the bond of unity broken at the time of the Great Western Schism?

No, it was not, for the election of Pope Urban VI was canonically valid, as Catholic (Hefele, Hergenröther, Pastor,

Kirsch, Denifle), and non-Catholic (Leo, Hinschius, Siebeking), scholars maintain. The true Papal succession was carried on all during the schism through Urban VI's legitimate successors, Boniface IX (1389-1404), Innocent VII (1404-1406) and Gregory XII (1406-1415). The official list of the Popes in the *Gerarchia Cattolica* of 1904 omits all mention of the Avignon or Pisan Popes—Clement VII, Benedict XIII and Alexander V—and in the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries the names of the Avignon Popes were used a second time (Clement VII, 1523-1534; Benedict XIII, 1724-1730).

According to St. Thomas (IIa. IIæ., Q. 39, art. 1) "schismatics properly so called are those who WILLINGLY and INTENTIONALLY separate themselves from the unity of the Church," as Cerularius in Constantinople in 1053, and Henry VIII in England in 1534. It is probable that Clement VII and the worldly-minded French Cardinals who elected him were schismatics in the real sense, but I doubt if during the whole period of the schism the total number of real schismatics numbered more than one hundred. It is true that Urban VI, immediately after his election, gave just cause for complaint by his arbitrary conduct and his violent temper, but that did not justify the seceding Cardinals in declaring his election invalid. For months they had recognized him as legitimate Pope, assisting at his enthronement at St. John Lateran's, and his coronation at St. Peter's, asking numerous favors at his hands, and officially announcing his election to the six absent Cardinals at Avignon, several Spanish Bishops, the Emperor, the French King, Charles V, the Elector Palatine, and the Count of Flanders.

The election of Urban VI had taken place under circumstances so peculiar that, once his electors had renounced their allegiance, it was practically impossible for outsiders to know the real facts in the case. The nations divided on political lines, England and Flanders acknowledging the Italian, while France, Scotland and Spain adhered to the French Popes. It was in reality, as Pastor states, "nothing but the conflict of two nations for the possession of the Papacy; the Italians wished to recover it and the French would not let it be wrested from them" (*History of the Popes*, i., 146). Theologians, canonists and even saints divided on national lines, St. Catherine of Siena acknowledging Urban VI, and St. Vincent Ferrer upholding Clement VII.

The Great Schism was, therefore, not a schism in the ordinary sense of the term, because there never was any question of the unity of faith, nor of the supremacy of the Pope. The only problem was: Which one of the two or three claimants is the legitimate Pope? As Father Smith says: "They were not schismatics, because they acknowledged the Papal authority.

did their best to discover who was its true living incumbent, and were prepared to submit at once when the discovery was made. There was, moreover, a true Pope all the time, for the fact that this truth was involved in doubt did not make it less a truth, and this true Pope was a true fountain of authority, and a true source of unity to all the world" (*The Great Schism of the West,* 45).

Catholics readily admit that the Great Schism shook the authority of the Church to its very foundations, and prepared the way for the sixteenth century revolt (Pastor, *ibid.,* i., 142), but at the same time they regard it as a manifest proof of the divine character of the Papacy. "What human institution could have withstood this trial?" asks de Maistre (*Du Pape,* iv.), and a bitter opponent of the Papacy, Gregorovius, declares that the Schism merely proves that the idea of the Papacy is indestructible and its unity unbreakable (*Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter,* vi., 620).

Bibliography: Pastor, *History of the Popes,* i., 117-207; Salembier, *The Great Schism of the West;* Valois, *La France et le Grand Schisme.* A. Q. 1891, 67.—D. A. xxii. 1228.—R. C. xxxvii. 603.

THE SANCTITY OF THE CHURCH

What do you mean by the holiness of the Church, and why do you claim that she alone has that distinguishing mark? Are there not many devout souls in other religions and other Christianities?

Holiness implies nearness to God, the Author and Source of all holiness (Isa. vi. 3; Apoc. iv. 8). For this reason the Bible calls certain places holy, because God has specially blessed them (Exod. iii. 5; Matt. iv. 5); certain things holy, because they have been dedicated to divine worship (Exod. xxix. 29; Heb. ix. 2); and certain persons holy, because they are closely united to God by charity (Tob. ii. 12; Rom. i. 7; Apoc. v. 3).

The Catholic Church is holy, because her Founder, Jesus Christ, is God, the Infinite Source of all holiness. He alone could confidently challenge His enemies: "Which of you shall convince Me of sin?" (John viii. 46.) The founders of the other churches—Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Wesley—and of other religions—Gotama, Mahomet—were but men, and men in no way remarkable for eminent or heroic virtue.

The Catholic Church is holy, because of her intimate union with Christ as His Bride (Eph. v. 23-32) and His Mystical Body (1 Cor. xii. 27; Eph. i. 22; iv. 12; v. 30). "We are members

of His Body, of His Flesh and of His Bones." Catholics are a "chosen people" and a "holy nation," because they are branches of the true Vine, Christ Jesus (John xv. 5). Although men outside her fold may, through invincible ignorance, be members of the Church in desire, and thus share in her divine life, their churches are but "withered branches, that do not abide in Him" (John xv. 1-6).

The Catholic Church is holy, not because there are no sinners in her fold (Matt. xiii. 24-30; 47, 48), but because her one aim is to produce sanctity. "Christ also loved the Church, and delivered Himself up for it that He might sanctify it . . . that it should be holy and without blemish" (Eph. v. 25-27). The ideal she presents to the world is identical with Christ's: "Be you therefore perfect, as also your heavenly Father is perfect" (Matt. v. 48). She has ever taught infallibly the entire Gospel of Christ, for she wished her children to possess "this mind which was also in Christ Jesus" (Phil. ii. 5). She has ever interpreted infallibly the commandments and counsels of the Savior, for He said: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments" (Matt. xix. 17). "All men take not this word, but they to whom it is given. . . . He that can take it, let him take it" (Matt. xix. 11, 12). "If thou wilt be perfect, sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow Me" (Matt. xix. 21). She has ever infallibly given her children the means of grace instituted by Christ in the Mass and the seven Sacraments, whereby the Precious Blood of Christ shed upon the Cross is applied for our sanctification and redemption.

The virtues of Catholics are in exact proportion to their faithful acceptance of her doctrines, their faithful observance of her commandments and counsels, their faithful attendance at holy Mass, and their frequent reception of her Sacraments. The sinners within her fold, at whom outsiders often point the finger of scorn, are beyond question those very Catholics who disobey her laws, and neglect her Sacraments. The accusations of evil-doing that controversialists like Coulton or Lea are fond of making against the Church would be without point, if the Church's teaching were not opposed to the sins they stigmatize.

The Catholic Church is holy in her saints. In the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. Paul, the word "saint" is always used as an equivalent to "Christian," proof positive that all Christians are called to a life of holiness (Acts xi. 16; Rom. viii. 27; Eph. i. 1). But the Church means more than this, when she requires special honor to be paid to the men and women she calls saints. While she does produce the ordinary fruits of sanctity on a very extensive scale the saints she canonizes are souls who practiced sanctity to a heroic de-

gree. Sanctity is to ordinary goodness what genius is to talent, or the courage of the average soldier to the heroism of the leader of a forlorn hope. The first saints honored in the Church were the martyrs, who in the first three centuries gladly suffered every kind of torments for their faith (Allard, *Ten Lectures on the Martyrs*). Our Lord tells us that charity, which unites us with God, is the very essence of sanctity. "If anyone love Me, he will keep My word; and My Father will love him, and We will come to him, and will make Our abode with him" (John xiv. 23; *Cf.* 1 John iv. 16). The greatest lovers of God were the martyrs—"Greater love than this no man hath, that a man lay down his life for his friends" (John xv. 13). The Church considers all the just, who are in the state of grace, the friends of God, but she calls no one a saint unless he practices in an eminent degree all the virtues (Col. iii. 12-14; 1 Cor. xiii. 4-7). "Sanctity is a general virtue, in so far as by its command it directs the acts of all the virtues to the Divine God" (St. Thomas, IIa. IIæ., Q. 81, art. 8).

From the days of the proto-martyr, St. Stephen (Acts vii. 58), to St. Thérèse of Lisieux, the Catholic Church has been the fruitful mother of saints. A body of critical scholars, the Bollandists, have been busy since 1643, transcribing their marvelous lives in some sixty-four folio volumes (Delehaye, *The Work of the Bollandists*). They have died for Christ as St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Polycarp, St. Agnes and St. Cecilia; they have won whole nations to Christ, like St. Patrick, St. Boniface, St. Ansgar, St. Method and St. Francis Xavier; they have founded religious orders of men and women that won countless souls to the perfect following of the evangelical counsels like St. Benedict, St. Bernard, St. Francis, St. Dominic, St. Madeleine Barat; they have given up everything this life holds dear to care for the sick (St. Camillus), the poor (St. Vincent de Paul), the prisoner among the Moslem (St. John of Matha; St. Felix of Valois); they have valiantly defended the faith in every part of the world (St. Athanasius, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, St. Ambrose, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Canisius); they have counseled Popes (St. Catherine of Siena), and led their country to victory against an alien foe (St. Jeanne d'Arc); they have revealed the inmost secrets of the world of spirit (St. Teresa of Avila, St. John of the Cross).

The Catholic Church is holy, because, like Christ and the Apostles, she has always worked miracles to confirm her claim as their divine representative until the end of the world. Christ Himself gives the lie to non-Catholics who hold that miracles ended with the Apostles. "And these signs shall follow them that believe; in My name they shall cast out devils; they shall speak with tongues . . . they shall lay their hands

upon the sick, and they shall recover" (Mark xvi. 18). No honest inquirer can rightly question the miracles wrought every year at Lourdes through our Lady's intercession, for no court in the world so carefully weighs the proofs for an alleged miracle as the *Bureau des Constatations* of that city (Bertrin, *Lourdes;* Grandmaison, *Twenty Cures at Lourdes;* Le Bec, *Medical Proof of the Miraculous;* Marchand, *The Facts of Lourdes*).

St. Cyprian thus writes of the holiness of the Church: "The spouse of Christ cannot become adulterate; she is undefiled and chaste. She owns but one home; she guards the sanctity of one chamber. She keeps us for God; she appoints unto the kingdom the sons that she has borne. Whosoever has separated from the Church is joined to an adulteress; he is cut off from the promises of the Church. Neither shall he come unto the rewards of Christ, who leaves the Church. He is an alien, an outcast, an enemy. He can no longer have God for a Father, who has not the Church for a Mother" (*On the Unity of the Church,* 5).

We readily admit that there are many devout souls outside the Catholic Church, as every priest who has had much experience with converts can bear witness. I have baptized many a Lutheran farmer in the Northwest, who had kept the Ten Commandments faithfully for years, like the young man of the Gospel (Matt. xix. 20), and many a High Church Episcopalian in New York City, who went regularly to Confession and Communion, firmly but erroneously convinced that they were receiving the grace of real Sacraments. Their good lives were not due to their heresy or schism, but to the grace of God, who "will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. ii. 4). On questioning them, I found that for years they had been believing many a Catholic doctrine, and observing many a Catholic law. They had not sinned against the light, but had acted like St. Paul, "ignorantly and in unbelief" (1 Tim. i. 3). Once within the fold, they realized that the Catholic Church alone was the one divine school of sanctity.

Luther's denial of free will and of the efficacy of good works made all real sanctity impossible, and his substitution of sentiment for reason led to extreme anarchic views even in his own day, and to the present widespread indifferentism and unbelief. Calvin's absolute predestination with a God as the Author of evil destroyed sanctity at its root, and his bitter denunciation of innocent amusements in Geneva has given the world a pseudo-morality, which condones divorce and birth control, while it invents a new sin by enacting an unenforceable prohibition law.

In the name of the liberty of private judgment Luther set aside the Mass as an "abomination," and falsified the Church's

teaching regarding the Sacraments, thus depriving Christians of the divine means of holiness. His modernistic descendants to-day, denying totally the supernatural content of the Bible, trace the origin of the Sacraments to the pagan mystery cults, and declare that the Commandments, he said could not be kept, are the mere utterances of an ignorant Semitic tribe.

No one can deny that "the present breakdown of authority in religious matters is due to the rejection of the authority of the Catholic Church as effect to cause; or that the greed and selfishness which afflicts the modern commercial countries is due to Protestant individualism" (Grimley, in *The Church,* 167). The heroic sanctity that characterizes Catholic saints is nowhere to be found outside the Catholic Church. We would advise our questioner to read the lives of some of our saints. He will perhaps be led to the Church thereby as an English army officer I once baptized. He said: "Your Church breeds men. The finger of God is here."

We list a few modern lives that will be of interest; Antony, *St. Catherine of Siena;* Bertrand, *St. Augustine;* Bougaud, *St. Vincent de Paul;* Cavanaugh, *St. Thomas Aquinas;* Capecelatro, *St. Philip Neri;* Fouard, *St. Paul, St. Peter;* Guéranger, *St. Cecilia;* Herwegen, *St. Benedict;* Luddy, *St. Bernard;* Jarrett, *St. Dominic;* Lovat, *St. Teresa;* Largent, *St. Jerome;* De Julleville. *St. Jeanne d'Arc;* Morris, *St. Patrick;* Oldmeadow, *St. Camillus;* Prat, *St. Paul;* Thompson, *St. Ignatius;* Ward, *St. Madeleine Barat.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bagshawe, *The Church;* Benson, *Ecclesia; The Church of Christ;* Delehaye, *Sanctus;* Hugueney, *Catholicism and Criticism,* xi.; Sertillanges, *The Church.* A. Q. 1896, 713.

If your Church is a holy Church, why do you allow adulterers, drunkards and corrupt politicians to be members in good standing? Should not moral character be insisted upon as a qualification of church membership? Why are there so many poor and ignorant in your Church?

Because the Church is the universal Kingdom of God, divinely commissioned to teach Christ's Gospel to all men—sinner and saint, rich and poor, cultured and uncultured—alike. "There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither bond nor free; there is neither male nor female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. iii. 28). The Church is not a Church of the elect, as Wyclif taught, or Calvin; nor is she an exclusive club for the outwardly respectable and the well-to-do.

Sinners are rarely excommunicated from her fold, and only for some flagrant sin, just as traitors and convicted criminals

are debarred by the State from citizenship. The adulterer, the drunkard or the corrupt politician is not in "good standing," for he is not permitted to receive Communion, until he manifests a heartfelt sorrow for his sins in the Sacrament of Penance.

Christ came into the world for sinners: The angel Gabriel said to Mary: "Thou shalt call His name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins" (Matt. i. 21). Christ Himself said: "The Son of Man is come to save that which is lost" (Matt. xviii. 11). "I am not come to call the just, but sinners" (Matt. ix. 13). In spite of His conscious preeminence as the sinless Son of God, our Lord spent His life by choice among the poor and ignorant, without ever humbling them by His condescension. One of the signs whereby He was to be recognized as the Messias was the fact that He was to preach "the Gospel to the poor" (Matt. xi. 5).

Christ always speaks of the Church as a Society composed of the good and the wicked. He compares it to a field in which cockle grows with the wheat (Matt. xiii. 24-30); to a net containing good and bad fishes (Matt. xiii. 47); to a barn containing chaff as well as wheat (Matt. iii. 12); to wise and foolish virgins (Matt. xxv. 1-12). St. Paul also speaks of a "great house having vessels not only of gold and silver, but also of wood and earth; or honor and dishonor" (2 Tim. ii. 20). And St. John writes to remind us that we are all sinners: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" (1 John i. 8).

I remember meeting in Boston a Unitarian minister from Burlington, Vermont, who told me he was about to resign his ministry, because his efforts to gather in the unchurched poor of his city had been met with a decided protest on the part of his wealthy parishioners. The true Church frowns on such narrowness. She always sees Christ in the poor. "As long as you did it to one of these, My least brethren, you did it to Me" (Matt. xxv. 41). Sinners will remain in the Church until the harvest (Matt. xiii. 30), *i. e.*, until Christ at the Last Day separates forever the sheep from the goats (Matt. xxv. 32).

Will you not admit that many of the leaders of your Church—her Popes, Bishops and priests—have been wicked men? How can you call such a Church holy?

The Church remains holy, no matter how many of her leaders prove faithless to the Gospel they preach, for these men are cut off from the Church's life by their sins, which can never be traced to her teachings or laws. Would you call an apple tree bad, because you discovered some rotten apples lying on the ground beneath it? No, you judge the tree by the ripening or

ripe apples on its boughs. Wicked churchmen will one day have to render a strict account to Almightly God for their stewardship, for as Christ said: "Unto whomsoever much is given, of him much will be required" (Luke xii. 16).

Out of a long line of worthy Popes, seventy-six of whom are reckoned among the saints, only a few were unworthy of their high office, such as John XII (955-964), Benedict IX (1024-1032), and Alexander VI (1492-1503). But the proportion of unworthy Apostles was one out of twelve. No world dynasty can be compared from the standard of virtue with our illustrious dynasty of two hundred and sixty-two Popes.

At all periods of Church history there have been unworthy Bishops and priests, but as a rule they either repented of their sins before they died, or proved their utter wickedness by apostatizing in times of trial and persecution, or by lapsing into formal heresy and schism.

Is it fair to be ever citing the evil lives of the minority, when all admit that the majority of clerics have ever been faithful to God and the things of God? Dean Maitland, an honest non-Catholic historian, says: "It appears to be the testimony of history that the monks and clergy were at all times and places better than the people" (*The Dark Ages*, viii.). Voltaire, the arch enemy of Christianity, makes the same admission.

Why are Catholic nations less prosperous than Protestant ones? Why is it that every country in which Romanism prevails, the people are most backward and unprogressive?

Jesus Christ never made material prosperity a mark of His true Church; He never declared worldly success a sign of the divine favor. On the contrary, He is so outspoken against the sins incident to riches, that some unthinking socialists have claimed Him for their own.

Christ says that no man can serve both God and Mammon (Matt. vi. 24), and asserts that riches may often prove an insuperable obstacle to a man's gaining the kingdom of heaven: "Woe to you that are rich; for you have your consolation" (Luke vi. 24). "It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. xix. 24). He insists upon the fact that His "kingdom is not of this world" (John xviii. 36), and adds: "What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and suffer the loss of his own soul?" (Matt. xvi. 26.) Hell was the portion, not of the poor Lazarus, but of Dives (Luke xvi. 19-31).

St. Paul is no defender of the prosperity argument, for he writes: "Having wherewith to be covered, with these we are content" (1 Tim. vi. 8). St. Peter is not its apologist, for he boasts of having "left all things" to follow Christ (Mark x. 28; *Cf.* James ii. 8).

Material prosperity is no guarantee of the divine favor, for otherwise the Unchangeable God would be as changeable as His creatures. Did God sanction the idolatry of pagan Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Greece or Rome in the days of their political prosperity? Did God declare the religion of the Jews false when they were slaves under Pharaoh, or Christianity untrue when the early Christians were persecuted to the death by the mighty, prosperous Romans?

A criterion that works both ways is evidently false. Did God sanction the Catholicism of Spain in the days when Philip II ruled the world, and does He reject it to-day when Spain has lost most of her colonies and her monies? Did God sanction the Protestantism of Holland in the seventeenth century when she fought England as an equal, and did the carrying trade of Europe, and does He denounce it to-day, because she has lost her rank among the first-class powers?

No, material prosperity has nothing to do with a nation's religion. It never is a sign of God's favor. A country's progress and development depend on the fertility of its soil, the wealth of its mines of gold, silver, coal, copper and iron; on the inventions of machinery, steam and electricity; on the energy and industry of its people. A pagan can make money out of a large wheat farm in the Northwest as well as a Catholic; a Jew can make a fortune out of an oil-well in Texas as well as a Protestant.

In our day no country can rightly be called Catholic or Protestant, for things have changed greatly in the last four hundred years. Is France Catholic? It is said that about 30,000,000 of its people do not make their Easter duty. Is the United States Protestant? Half its church-goers are Catholic, and some fifty millions at least never put foot inside of any Christian church.

If a comparison is to be made, let it be made between Catholicism and Protestantism as a civilizing force. This comparison has been made by Balmes in his *European Civilization,* by Graham in his *Prosperity, Catholic and Protestant,* and by Young in his *Catholic and Protestant Countries Compared.*

Cardinal Newman thus answers this objection: "The world believes in the world's ends as the greatest of goods; it wishes society to be governed entirely for the sake of this world. Provided it could gain one little islet in the ocean, one foot upon the coast, at the cost of a hundred lives and a hundred souls, it

would think it a very good bargain. . . . The world-wide Church, like her Divine Founder, regards, consults for, labors for the individual soul; she looks at the souls for whom Christ died, and who are made over to her, and her one object, for which everything is sacrificed, is to acquit herself well of this awful responsibility. . . . Not till the State is blamed for not making saints, may it be fairly laid to the fault of the Church that she cannot invent a steam engine or construct a tariff" (*Anglican Difficulties*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Balmes, *European Civilization;* Graham, *Prosperity, Catholic and Protestant;* Schanz, *A Christian Apology,* ii., ch. xv.; Vaughan, *Faith and Folly,* 441-475.

CASUISTRY

Does not your Jesuitical system of casuistry with its immoral doctrine of probability undermine the ethics of the Gospel as Harnack declared (*Dogmengeschichte,* ii. 641)? Did not Pascal in his *Provincial Letters* bring out clearly the low ethical standards of your Church?

No, there is nothing in the teaching of moral theology that undermines the ethics of the Gospel. The Ten Commandments and the fundamental Christian virtues have always been clearly taught and fully explained by the Catholic Church in the light of a divine and infallible tradition, so that the Catholic conscience has never been the slave of a shifty, unethical public opinion. While the way of perfection is set forth in our ascetical and mystical writers, the moral theologians are concerned with the minimum of duty, writing as they do for confessors, who are bound to insist only upon that which is of absolute obligation.

Casuistry in morals corresponds to case law and precedent in our law courts. It is merely the application in a particular case of the general principles of Catholic ethics. It has always existed in the Church, and is in no sense a creation of the Jesuits, although they have done much to systematize its findings. St. Paul, for example, was a casuist, when he decided many a moral question in his Epistles, such as the eating of meat sacrificed to idols, the fact of women wearing veils in church, the prohibition of divorce, the right of separation, etc. Many moral questions were discussed by the early Fathers, the Popes and the Bishops, the particular and general councils of the Church.

Pascal's tirades against probabilism were most unfair, for

the doctrine is plain common sense. Suppose, for instance, that I have a serious, outstanding doubt about the existence of a certain law, obliging me to act in a particular case. Although I know it exists, I honestly doubt whether it touches my case. I have done my best to obtain certainty, and cannot obtain it; I have carefully weighed all the circumstances; I find I have good arguments from reason, and grave authorities against the law. I certainly then have a probable opinion that this law, being doubtful, has no binding obligation. What could be more reasonable?

The nineteen *Lettres* of Pascal, *escritte à un Provincial,* prove him a master of the French tongue, but at the same time prove him a poor theologian and a prejudiced and inaccurate controversialist. Of the tens of thousands of cases in the Jesuit moral treatises Pascal selects 132, 43 of which are repetitions. Belloc in his excellent pamphlet on the *Provincial Letters* thus summarizes his analysis. Three cases are wrongly quoted, 17 are merely frivolous, 7 are protests against common sense decisions with which all the world now agrees, 2 are so put as to suggest what the casuist never said, 11 are verbal tricks, deceiving the reader by the suppression of an essential fact in the opponent's position, 35 deal with points of Catholic practice which do not concern non-Catholics.

Only 14 cases, therefore, merit any consideration whatever. Of these 8 were finally condemned at Rome, and 3 others, although not actually condemned, are so twisted from their real meaning as to merit condemnation. A just analysis, therefore, leaves three cases, one on simony, one on the action of judges for a benefit, one on usury—all of which are doubtful. And so this much quoted attack upon the morality of the Jesuits and upon the Church melts into thin air. As Belloc concluded: "This conclusion is dry and without savor. But it is exact."

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Belloc, *Pascal's "Provincial Letters";* Mausbach, *Catholic Moral Teaching,* 57-127; Rickaby, *Moral Philosophy,* 153-158. A. Q. 1890, 472.—D. T. ii. 1859-1877.—Kirchenlexicon ii. 2035.

THE CATHOLICITY OF THE CHURCH

Why do you apply the term "Catholic" exclusively to your Church? Have not Anglo-Catholics a rightful claim to the name? and Easterns also? Do not all Christians profess that they believe in the Catholic Church, when they recite the Apostles' Creed? Are there not more Protestants than Roman Catholics in the world to-day?

Because our Church alone is Catholic or universal in time, doctrine and extent. She has existed in perfect continuity from the time of Christ and will last until His Second Coming. She teaches all His gospel, and administers all His divine means of salvation. She is not confined to any particular region or nation, but is widespread among all the nations of the world. The word Catholic does not denote a quality. One cannot be Anglo, Eastern or Liberal Catholic; one cannot be more or less Catholic. One either is a Catholic or he is not (Grimley, in *The Church,* 154).

The Eastern schismatics are not Catholic in time, for they date only from the fifth (the Lesser Eastern Churches) or from the eleventh century (the Orthodox Eastern Church). The Protestant churches are not Catholic in time because they date from the sixteenth (Lutherans and Anglicans), the seventeenth (Baptists), the eighteenth (Methodists), or the nineteenth century (the Disciples of Christ). The outside churches are not Catholic in faith, because they have broken away from the center of unity, the Roman See, and question many of Christ's laws and doctrines. They are not Catholic in extent, for, from the beginning of their secession, they have identified themselves with some particular nation—Germany, the Scandinavian countries, England, Russia, Bulgaria, Roumania, Serbia, Greece.

Mere profession of a Creed does not constitute one a Catholic, for the different separatist churches read into it their own peculiar opinions. A number of different sects scattered all over the world do not constitute a Catholic Church. Catholicism implies a divine unity of government, faith and worship.

The Old Testament in many a passage prophesied that the Church of the Messias would be a universal Kingdom (Gen. xii. 3; Ps. ii. 8; xxi. 8; lxii. 11; lxxi. 8; lxxxv. 9; Isa. ii. 2; ix. 7; lix. 5; Dan. ii. 35; vii. 26; Mal. i. 10, 11; Zach. ix. 10).

The New Testament always contrasts the universality of the New Law with the national character of the Old. It is true that Christ and the Apostles first preached to the Jews. "He came unto His own" (John i. 11). "Go ye rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. x. 6). But our Lord reminds the Jews time and time again that the kingdom He is about to establish is a world-wide Kingdom, both in time and in extent. When He heals the centurion's servant, He prophesies that the Gentile multitudes "shall come from the East and the West" into His Church (Matt. viii. 11). He tells the Samaritan woman: "The hour cometh, when you shall neither on this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, adore the Father" (John iv. 21). In His parables He speaks of the Sower "whose field is the world," and "whose harvest is the end of the world" (Matt. xiii. 38, 39), and of the Jewish Vineyard, which shall be trans-

ferred to other, *i. e.,* Gentile husbandmen" (Matt. xxi. 41, 43). Before His Resurrection He declares that "the Gospel is to be preached in the whole world" and "unto all nations" (Matt. xxiv. 14; xxvi. 13; Mark xiii. 10; xiv. 9), and after it, He gives a universal commission to His Apostles: "Going, therefore, teach ye all nations." "Go ye into the whole world, and preach the Gospel to every creature" (Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15; Luke xxiv. 47).

The early Fathers often declare that the Church is Catholic, because it is spread over the whole earth, and teaches everywhere "universally and completely all the doctrines which ought to come to men's knowledge" (St. Cyril, *Catecheses,* xviii., 23; *Cf.* St. Irenæus, *Adv. Haer.,* iii., 17; Origen, *Cont. Celsum,* ii., 13; *In Num.,* xii.; St. Optatus, *De Schis. Don.,* ii., 1). The teaching of St. Augustine may be studied in the two volumes of Batiffol's *Le Catholicisme de Saint Augustin.* After mentioning various reasons why he is a Catholic, St. Augustine writes: "The name itself of the Catholic Church keeps me, a name which in the midst of so many heresies, this Church alone has, not without cause, so held possession of, that, although all heretics would fain have themselves called Catholics, yet to the inquiry of any stranger, 'Where is the assembly of the Catholic Church held?,' no heretic would dare point out his own basilica or house" (*Contr. Epis. Manichaei Fund.,* 5). In another place he writes: "The Church is called Catholic by all her enemies, as well as by her own children. Heretics and schismatics can call the Church by no other name than Catholic, for they would not be understood, unless they used the name by which the Church is known to the whole world" (*De Vera Religione,* 7).

The Catholic Church is Catholic in time, because while we can accurately fix the date of every heresy and schism, no one can assign any date to her origin save the day of Pentecost. The admission of her perpetuity is often made unconsciously. I remember years ago, an old Methodist minister who, introducing a young Catholic priest to a public audience, said: "It gives me great pleasure as an *old* member of a *new* Church to introduce a *young* member of the *old* Church."

The Catholic Church is Catholic in extent, outnumbering any one sect; in fact, she is greater than all of them together. A Protestant writer in the *American Encyclopedia* gives the following statistics: Catholics, 294,583,999; Protestants, 194,102,000, and Eastern Schismatics, 120,729,000. The Vatican Missionary Exposition in 1927 gave the following figures: Catholics, 305,000,000; Protestants, 220,000,000, and Eastern Schismatics, 158,000,000 (*Catholic Missions in Figures and Symbols*). Mere numbers, of course, would not constitute Catholicity, but the Church's *de facto* numerical superiority points to her *de jure*

Catholicity,—her universal divine commission to spread the one faith among all nations.

"The Church," says Karl Adam, "is not one society or one Church alongside many others, nor is she just a Church among men; she is the Church of men, the Church of mankind. It is this claim that gives her action its persevering determination and its grandeur. Her members belong to this or that nation, and national interests are bound to exert some influence on the Church's action. There have even been times when the Church seemed to be no more than a handmaid of the German Emperor or the French King. But these were only episodes, only brief and passing checks in her world-wide mission. She had to fight hard for it again and again, in bitter struggles, but she won for herself, in virtue of her mission to all mankind, her spiritual freedom from princes and peoples, and so secured the sovereignty of the Kingdom of God, and the independence of Christian faith and morals" (*The Spirit of Catholicism,* 146).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bagshawe, *The Credentials of the Catholic Church;* Berry, *The Church of Christ;* Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul,* ii., 280.

Does the Bible ever speak of the "Catholic Church"? If not, where is it first mentioned? When was "Protestant" first used? Does not the title "Roman Catholic" localize your Church as one of the branches of the Church universal? Why do Catholics object to the terms "Romish" or "Romanist"?

The name Catholic as a name is not applied to the Catholic Church in the Bible, although the idea of the Church in the mind of Christ and the Apostles is clearly set forth by this Greek word, which means "universal." St. Ignatius of Antioch, writing to the Christians of Smyrna about the year 110, is the first to use the name "The Catholic Church." He writes: "Where the Bishop is, there let the multitude of believers be; even as where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church" (*Ad Smyr.*, viii., 2). *The Martydom of St. Polycarp* (155) mentions "The Catholic Church" in three passages (viii., 1; xvi., 2; xix., 2). At the beginning of the third century, as Father d'Herbigny says, "The dogmatic sense of the word 'Catholic' is evident; the true Church is the Church that is called Catholic" (*De Ecclesia,* ii., 72). He cites Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.*, vii., 18), Origen (*In Jos.*, ix., 8), among the Greeks, the Muratorian Fragment (200) and Tertullian (*Adv. Marcion,* iv., 4; *De Præs.*, xxx.) among the Latins. In this last passage Tertullian speaks of the "Catholica" when he means the Church. St. Augustine uses the same word as a synonym of the Church 240 times (*Revue Benedictine,* 1900, 1-9)

The Diet of Spires in 1529, while granting religious liberty to the Lutheran States, demanded toleration for Catholics dwelling within their boundaries (Alzog, *History of the Church,* iii., 75). The Lutheran princes—the Elector of Saxony, the Margrave of Brandenburg, the Landgrave of Hesse, the Dukes of Luneberg, and Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt—protested on the principle of "*cujus regio illius religio*—the religion of the people must be the same as the religion of the prince." The word "Protestant" therefore was born of the denial of freedom of conscience (Pastor, *History of the Popes,* x., 124).

The term "Roman Catholic" does not localize the Church, for it can be explained in an orthodox sense, as the Catholic Church whose center is Rome. In like manner people speak of the Washington Government, meaning the United States, whose center is Washington.

Catholics object to this term, because of its origin, its heretical intent, and its novelty. It was first introduced by Protestant controversialists in England, who keenly resented our claim to a monopoly of the name "Catholic" (Thurston, *M.,* Sept., Oct., 1911). It became general in legal and governmental circles during the seventeenth century in England, and has been used in a heretical sense of a branch Church ever since by the English government. For this reason the English Bishops protested against the term at the Vatican Council in 1870. The Church's official title is "The Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church"; in no official document has it ever styled itself "The Roman Catholic Church."

We object to the words "Romish" or "Romanist" because these words have ever been used in an insulting sense. The Standard Dictionary says: Romish—"Used by Protestants, and generally indicating disesteem." Romanist—"A term used chiefly by those whose views are adverse to that Church."

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Messenger, *Why Roman Catholic?;* Snead-Cox, *Life of Cardinal Vaughan,* ii., 7; Thurston, in the *C. E.,* xiii.—T. Dec. 23, Dec. 30, 1922.

APOSTOLICITY OF THE CHURCH

You claim that your Church alone is Apostolic. We believe it to be a corruption of the primitive Church, and that Luther by sending us to the Bible for our religion, restored the Church to its primitive purity. Is he not a true successor of the Apostles who holds to the Apostles' Creed, preaches Christ, and manifests Christ's love to the brethren?

We have already proved that Luther's theory of the transmission of Christ's revelation through the Bible interpreted by

the individual, is an impossible theory, leading to doctrinal divisions, indifferentism and unbelief. The modern Protestant view that revealed truth is handed down by purely human witnesses, whose authority depends solely on their natural abilities, is also utterly destructive of all certainty in religion. A man's critical scholarship, his profession of the Apostles' Creed, his devotedness to the people in no way prove that he is a successor of the Apostles.

Apostolicity implies that the true Church is the Church which Christ commissioned His Apostles to establish under the supremacy of St. Peter. He Himself chose the twelve Apostles, made St. Peter their head, and commissioned them to transmit infallibly all His divine revelation to all nations till the end of the world (Matt. iv. 18-22; Mark iii. 13; Luke vi. 13; John vi. 71; xv. 16; Matt. xvi. 18; Luke xxii. 31; John xxi. 15, 17; Matt. xxviii. 18; Mark xvi. 15; Luke x. 16; John xiv. 16).

The true Church is Apostolic in origin, doctrine and ministry. The true Church must trace its origin in unbroken line to Jesus and the twelve Apostles. Before giving His divine commission to the Apostles, Christ insists upon His divine commission from His heavenly Father. "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you" (John xxi. 21). "The very works that I do bear witness to Me that the Father hath sent Me" (John v. 36). "All power is given Me in heaven and in earth. Going, therefore, teach ye all nations" (Matt. xxviii. 18, 19). No individual has the right to associate himself with the Apostles; he must be "sent" or "commissioned" with divine authority. "How shall they preach," asks St. Paul, "unless they be sent?" (Rom. x. 15.)

A comparison may make this clear. If, for example, a body of twelve men receive from the owner of a large wheat farm in the Northwest the contract to gather in the whole harvest, they receive at the same time the right to hire as many other workers as are necessary to fulfill their contract. But no one can lawfully work in that field expecting payment, unless he has been empowered to do so by one of the twelve, or some one else acting in their name and with their authority. So the Lord of the harvest (Luke x. 1-12) has given the harvesting of the nations to the twelve Apostles and their legitimate successors until His Second Coming. No intruder or usurper outside the legitimate succession can have any jurisdiction. A break with the past proves that Apostolicity of origin has been lost. As our Lord put it: "He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up another way, the same is a thief and a robber" (John x. 1).

Apostolicity of origin is proof of Apostolicity of doctrine. God's Church cannot become corrupt, because He has promised to preserve it from error: "The gates of hell shall not prevail

against it" (Matt. xvi. 18). "I am with you all days" (Matt. xxviii. 20). "The Holy Spirit will abide with you forever" (John xiv. 16). Christ never said that the Bible would contain all His divine revelation; Christ never said that critical estimates of certain early documents would be a sufficient guarantee of His Gospel. The mere appeal to the Bible or to history is therefore beside the point. He did guarantee to keep His one true Church free from error until the end of the world.

Apostolicity of ministry implies the authority to teach, to rule and to sanctify, which has been handed down from the Apostles. Valid Orders alone do not guarantee an Apostolic ministry, for they may be conferred by men who are in heresy and schism. Valid Orders must be accompanied by legitimate jurisdiction, which comes only through union with the head of the Apostolic body, the See of Peter.

The only Church that can rightly claim that its origin is not due to a break with the past is the Catholic Church. The Eastern Churches broke with the past and lost the Apostolic succession when Cerularius was excommunicated by the Papal legates in 1054. The continental Protestants broke with the Apostolic Church at the time of Luther's revolt in 1520, and the English Protestants in 1559, when the State made Parker the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury.

When the early Fathers wished to use a most convincing argument to prove the true Church, they always appealed to the fact of its Apostolic origin. We often find them compiling authentic lists of the legitimate Bishops, especially with regard to the Apostolic See of Rome. As early as the second century we find the Syrian Hegesippus and the Greek Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, maintaining that the source and standard of the faith is the Apostolic tradition handed down in an unbroken succession of Bishops. "But it would be too long to enumerate here the series of all the Churches; it suffices to point out the Apostolic tradition, the teaching that has come down to us by episcopal succession in the Church of Rome, the greatest and most ancient of all, known everywhere, and founded in Rome by the two glorious Apostles, Paul and Peter" (*Adv. Her.*, iii., 3; *Cf.* Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, iv., 8).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Berry, *The Church of Christ;* Lattey, (ed.), *The Church;* Sertillanges, *The Church.*

THE CONTINUITY THEORY

Is not the Church of England and her offshoot, the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, continuous and identical with the Church in England prior

to the Reformation? Did not the pre-Reformation Kings and Bishops of England deny in many an instance the supremacy of the Pope? What of William the Conqueror, Edward III, and Bishop Grosseteste?

No, the continuity theory of modern High Churchmen is a myth, for the Established Church of England which dates from Elizabeth differs totally in government, doctrine and worship from the Catholic Church. No English King or Bishop prior to the Reformation ever denied the primacy of the Pope.

The Archbishops of Canterbury, primates of the English Church, were never recognized until their appointment had been confirmed by the Pope. When consecrated and invested with the pallium, which the Pope always sent them as a symbol of their rightful jurisdiction in union with him, the Church's supreme head, they swore "to defend the Roman Papacy against all men, to obey the commands of the Holy See with their whole strength, and to cause them to be obeyed by others" (Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, iii., 305; Rymer, *Foedera*, vi., 80). In their letters they continually style themselves the "legates of the Holy See," and declare "their service and obedience" to the Pope (Letter of Archbishop Chichely to Pope Martin V in 1426. Haddan and Stubbs, *Ecc. Conc.*, iii., 441, 541).

The English Bishops before the Reformation were never recognized without the Pope's confirmation, and as a rule were directly appointed by him. The oath taken at their consecration ran as follows: "I will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter, to the Holy Apostolic Roman Church, to my Lord Pope N— and his successors canonically entering. . . . I will give aid, saving my order, to defend and to maintain against every man the Papacy of the Roman Church and the Royalty of St. Peter. . . . So may God help me and these holy Gospels" (Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii., 199). Rome was always the supreme court of appeal in all important trials (Stubbs, *Cont. Hist.*, iii., 315). The Kings of England always recognized the Pope's supremacy in the matter of episcopal appointments, the granting of dispensations in the prohibited degrees, the receiving of Papal legates, and the accepting of Papal interdicts and excommunications.

All the disagreements between England and Rome prior to the Reformation were concerned with temporal, and not spiritual matters. For example William the Conqueror (1066-1087), while fully acknowledging the primacy of Gregory VII (1073-1085), refused, as he had a perfect right, to do feudal homage for his kingdom (Rivington, *Rome and England*, 39-50). Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln (1235-1253), is often brought forward by controversialists as an anti-Papal bishop (Perry, *Life and Times of Grosseteste*), but his letters edited by

Luard of Trinity, express the greatest reverence for the Pope, and prove his firm belief in the Pope's supreme jurisdiction. In his differences with the Canterbury monks, with his own Chapter, and with Archbishop Boniface of Canterbury, he always appealed to Rome. It is true that he complained bitterly in a letter to one of the Pope's notaries in England about the bestowal of a benefice in his diocese upon an unworthy cleric, but that same letter says: "You know that I obey the Apostolic commands with filial affection and all devotion and reverence; and those things which are adverse to Apostolic commands, I oppose or withstand." To resist an unjust Papal demand is not to deny the Pope's right to make any demand; to question a certain act of Papal administration is not to deny the Pope's prerogative (Robinson, *Robert Grosseteste; M.*, August, 1880; March, 1895).

Edward III's Statute of Provisors (1351) which made the obtaining of an English benefice on provision of the Pope against the rights of patrons, an offence punishable by fine and imprisonment, and the Statute of Præmunire (1353) which outlawed all who sued in a foreign court in matters cognizable in the King's court, do not prove that the Church of fourteenth century England was anti-Papal. This is admitted by non-Catholic historians. Tout of Manchester writes: "The anti-Papal laws of the fourteenth century were acts of the secular, and not of the ecclesiastical power. . . . The clergyman, though his soul grew indignant against the curialists, still believed that the Pope was the divinely appointed autocrat of the Church universal. Being a man, a Pope might be a bad Pope, but the faithful Christian could not but obey in the last resort. The Papacy was so essentially interwoven with the whole Church of the Middle Ages, that few figments have less historical basis than the notion that there was an anti-Papal Anglican Church in the days of the Edwards" (*Political History of England*, iii., 379).

This legislation was not passed in a spirit of hostility to the Papal Supremacy, but was a protest against the abuses caused by "Rome runners," *i. e.*, priests thronging to Rome to ask for English benefices. The bishops and clergy protested against these acts, and often petitioned for their appeal. They were practically a dead letter, for we find 266 bishops provided by the Popes after the passing of these acts compared to 47 provided before them (*T.*, Dec. 3, 1893). In a word this legislation was not concerned with doctrine at all. The abstract rights of the Papacy were not denied; the curbing of abuses in administration was alone desired. "England objected to too much money going out, and too many foreigners coming in—that was all" (Hull, *The Later Medieval Period*, 107).

From the sixth to the sixteenth century the Catholic Church in England flourished and grew, as every other country of Christendom, in union with the divine center of unity, the Pope.

Under Henry VIII (1509-1547), England for the first time in her history denied the supremacy of the Pope, and thereby lapsed into schism. This grossly immoral Tudor despot, after trying in vain to persuade Pope Clement VII (1529-1534) to annul his valid marriage with Catherine of Aragon, determined to take the matter into his own hands. On January 25, 1533, he was married privately to his mistress, Anne Boleyn, by one of the Court chaplains without even the pretence of a divorce. Henry chose a married priest, Thomas Cranmer, to be Archbishop of Canterbury, deceiving the Pope, who would never have sent the bulls, had he been aware of his marriage and of his Protestant views. Within seven weeks (May 17) this time-serving apostate obediently declared Henry's marriage with Catherine null and void—forsooth to satisfy "the conscience of the King." Two years later he was just as willing to declare Henry's marriage with Anne invalid, for had not Henry, who now wished to marry Jane Seymour, seduced Anne's sister Mary? In November, 1634, a subservient Parliament enacted that "the King, his heirs and successors, should be taken and reputed *the only supreme heads on earth of the Church of England,* with full power to visit, reform and correct all such errors, heresies, abuses, contempts and enormities, which by any manner of *spiritual* authority ought to be reformed and corrected" (Lingard, *History of England,* v., 33; Hope, *The First Divorce of Henry VIII*).

Most of the cowardly English bishops proved recreaant to their trust, and the new nobility, enriched by the plunder of the Church lands, followed Henry in his schism. Saints like Sir Thomas More and Bishop John Fisher together, with some Franciscans and Carthusians, went gladly to the scaffold rather than acknowledge the King's supremacy in spirituals. "I cannot conform my conscience," said More, "to the counsel of one kingdom against the general consent of Christendom."

Under the boy King Edward VI, a mere puppet in the hands of the Somersets and Cranmer, the English Church, which in her outward appearance had remained unchanged under Henry, became out-and-out Protestant. The First Book of Common Prayer (1559), compiled by Cranmer and his Protestant confrères from the Sarum Missal and the Lutheran office books, was made compulsory throughout England by the Act of Uniformity. The Latin breviary and the missal were superseded by an English prayer book, which was intended to do away with the Mass, and the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. Fines and imprisonment were imposed upon all clerics and laymen

who did not at once hand over all the old Catholic liturgical books, and the King's Council ordered all altars to be destroyed in the churches, and tables set up in their stead. The Protestant Bishop Ridley, who had been given Bishop Bonner's See of London, at once proceeded to pull down the high altar in St. Paul's, while he ordered his clergy "to use only the ceremonies and gestures in the Book of Common Prayer and none other, so that there do not appear in them any counterfeiting of the Popish Mass." But even this book proved too "high" for the Swiss Reformers, who urged Cranmer to make a more drastic revision, which completely obliterated the slightest trace of the Catholic Mass. The Second Prayer Book of 1552 omitted every prayer which could possibly suggest the divine Sacrifice for the living and the dead (Gasquet-Bishop, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer*).

In 1550 Cranmer compiled a new Ordinal, which deliberately and intentionally excluded a priesthood capable of offering the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. As Pope Leo XIII says: "The history of that time is sufficiently eloquent of the animus of the authors of the Ordinal against the Catholic Church; as to the abettors whom they associated with themselves from heterodox sects; and as to the end in view; . . . Under a pretext of returning to the primitive form, they corrupted the liturgical order in many ways to suit the errors of the Reformers. For this reason, in the whole Ordinal not only is there no clear mention of the Sacrifice, but every trace of these things which had been in such prayers of the Catholic rite as they had not entirely rejected, was deliberately removed and struck out. . . . Once a new rite has been initiated, in which the Sacrament of Orders is adulterated and denied, and from which all idea of Consecration and Sacrifice has been rejected, the formula 'Receive the Holy Spirit' no longer holds good, and so the words 'For the office and work of a bishop,' and the like no longer hold good, but remain as words without the reality which Christ instituted" (Bull on Anglican Orders).

In 1552 Cranmer compiled the ultra-Protestant Forty-Two Articles, which Edward VI approved, and ordered all churchwardens, schoolmasters and clergymen to sign. He also drew up a code of ecclesiastical laws, which abolished the Roman canon law in England, and, although its publication was prevented by the death of the King, it reveals to us the anti-Catholic spirit of the leading Reformers. Divorces, *v. g.*, were allowed not only for adultery, but also for desertion, long absence, cruel treatment, and danger to health or life.

Under Queen Mary (1553-1558) the English Parliament, which had repudiated the Papacy under Henry VIII, and had decided upon a new national religion with its heretical service

books under Edward VI, passed bills rejecting the Protestantism of Henry VIII and Edward VI. The Reformed liturgy which four years before the English Parliament had declared "inspired by the Holy Ghost," it now declared "a new thing, imagined and devised by a few singular opinions" (Lingard, *The History of England,* v., 406). So long as the nobles were allowed to keep the Church land they had stolen, they were perfectly willing, if a Tudor ordered it, to vote the reconciliation of England with the Pope.

When Elizabeth came to the throne in 1558, England was again a Catholic country in full communion with Rome. She had professed herself a convert to the Catholic faith under Mary, but her ministers, with the clever but unscrupulous Cecil at the head—he too had gone to Mass under Mary—had little difficulty in persuading her "to put down a religion which proclaimed her a bastard, and to support the reformed doctrines, which alone could give stability to her throne" (*Ibid.,* vi., 7). In 1559 her first Parliament passed the Act of Supremacy, which declared the Queen "supreme governor in all things spiritual and temporal." All the Catholic bishops—there were sixteen at the time—with the one exception of Kitchen of Llandaff, steadfastly refused to take this sacrilegious oath, and were at once deprived of their sees. Two died in exile, one died in his home, and the other twelve were imprisoned until their death. In December, Elizabeth had Parker invalidly consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury by the defective Ordinal of Edward VI, and the Catholic bishops were replaced by invalidly consecrated Calvinistic laymen like Grindal, Jewel, Cox, Sandys, Parkhurst, Pilkington and others. In this way, in virtue of her civil authority alone, Elizabeth created and organized her own Church, the Protestant Established Church of England, which broke completely with the old religion which had from the sixth century been united with the center of Christian unity, Rome. The only continuity apparent was a continuity of the titles of the old Catholic sees, and the possession of some of the temporalities connected with the old bishoprics. Even this was not complete, for Elizabeth reannexed to the crown all the ecclesiastical property that had been restored to the bishops under Mary. She had learned her lesson well from her father. Both needed a bribery fund to attach to their side needy and avaricious favorites.

Parliament also passed the Act of Uniformity (1559), made the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI the church's official Prayer Book, and forbade under penalties any absence from the new Protestant services. The altars were again destroyed, and the Mass proscribed. In 1563 the Forty-Two Articles of Edward VI were revised and cut down to the Thirty-nine Articles, that still form the groundwork of the Protestant creed

of the Church of England. The details of these changes may be read in Pollen, *The English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth;* Birt, *The Elizabethan Religious Settlement,* and Meyer, *England and the Catholic Church Under Queen Elizabeth.*

In this way the national Protestant Church of England came into existence, and the English sovereigns and their Parliaments became the origin of all that Church's jurisdiction, and the sole arbiters of its laws, doctrines and worship. The idea of the Catholic Church as the Kingdom of God upon earth, independent, sovereign, universal and supernatural was forever lost, and a State Church substituted which was dependent, local, national, and purely natural.

Is it not strange, that some men of that church which for hundreds of years gloried in its Protestantism, and persecuted to the death five hundred martyrs who professed loyalty to the Pope and love for the Mass, should to-day repudiate the Reformation, and attempt to defend the unreal, unhistorical myth of continuity. As Cardinal Bourne well said in his Pastoral Letter for Lent, 1928: "No one who has really studied and understood the history of the English martyrs in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries can honestly maintain that there is any real continuity between the Elizabethan Church, still legally established in this country, and the Catholic Church set up among us by St. Augustine in 597, of which we Catholics, in union with the Apostolic See, are the sole legitimate representatives to-day."

Bibliography: Bourne, *Elizabethan Continuity;* Clayton, *Continuity in the Church of England;* Lingard, *History of England,* iv., v., vi.; Moyes, *Continuity;* Rivington, *Rome and England.* M. April, 1925.

THE EARLY BRITISH CHURCH

Was not the early British Church independent of Rome? Did not the British Church refuse to accept St. Augustine for its Archbishop, proving that it denied the Papal supremacy, and differed doctrinally from the Roman Church?

The early British Church was not independent of Rome, nor did its teaching differ in any way from the beliefs held by the universal Church.

It is true that owing to their isolation from the rest of Christendom, the Britons differed from the Roman Church in certain matters of discipline, such as the immersing of the catechumen in baptism once instead of thrice, the manner of wearing the tonsure, and the computing of the date of Easter. But even their obsolete custom of computing Easter originated in Rome (Warren, *Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church*).

The speech of the hermit Dinoth in Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* (ii., 2), is regarded by many non-Catholic scholars as "spurious" (Bright, *Early English History*, 96) or "apocryphal" (Haddan and Stubbs, *Conc.*, i., 142). But even if it be substantially correct, it certainly does not prove that the British Church was independent of Rome. The British bishops refused to obey St. Augustine, because he came to them as the friend of their most bitter enemies. Had they been heretics or schismatics, would the Roman Augustine have dreamed of inviting them to help him convert the hated Saxons?

The early British Church owed its existence to Rome. Its chief bishoprics were in the towns occupied by the Roman legions; its earliest martyrs bore Roman names; the earliest antiquarian remains of British Christianity were found in Canterbury, Dover and Richborough, where Roman soldiers had been stationed. In the second and third centuries we find mention of British Christians in Tertullian (*Adv. Jud.*, viii., 2) and in Origen (*In Luc*, xiii.). British bishops attended the Councils of Arles in 314, Nice in 325, Sardica in 347; they were also present at the French Councils of Tours in 461, Vannes in 465, Orleans in 511, and Paris in 555. This proves that they agreed doctrinally with the universal Church.

In 410 a Briton by birth, Bishop Victricius of Rouen, wrote Pope Innocent I (401-417) "for the rule and authority of the Roman Church," so as to offset the harm done by the Pelagian heresy (Hardouin, *Conc.*, i., 999). The Pope in his reply asks him to refer the ecclesiastical affairs of Britain to him, as the Council of Sardica had decreed. There is certainly no trace of schism or heresy in these letters.

St. Prosper of Aquitaine, secretary to Pope Leo the Great (440-461), tells us that Pope Celestine (422-432) sent Germanus of Auxerre as his legate to Britain in 429 to preserve in its integrity the faith of its people (*Chron. ann.*, 429).

The logic of our "continuity" theorists is greatly at fault. As Matthews puts it: "If the British Church refused to have anything to do with the English Church, how can the latter be in continuity with the former? And if the Briton's opposition to St. Augustine, amounted to a rejection of Papal jurisdiction, is not this admitting that St. Augustine, the first Archbishop of Canterbury, the first hierarchical head of the Church in England, was neither more nor less than a Papal emissary? But then what becomes of the independent national character claimed for the Church of England, if it was so Popish at its birth?" (Matthews, *Continuity Reconsidered*, 10.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Hornyold, *The Early British Church;* Rivington, *Rome and England.* C. W. lv. 766.—D. Jan., 1890.

ST. PETER IN ROME

What proofs can you offer that St. Peter was ever in Rome?

The proofs are so many and so overwhelming that many non-Catholic scholars, Protestants and Rationalists alike, have admitted this fact without question. I mention about twenty in England, France and Germany: Bleck, Cave, Credner, Cludius, De Wette, Grotius, Hales, Hilgenfeld, Lardner, Macknight, Mangold, Meyer, Mynster, Neander, Renan, Steiger, Wieseler, Whiston and Whitby.

Cave writes: "That Peter was at Rome, and held the See there for some time, we fearlessly affirm with the whole multitude of the ancients. We give witnesses above all exception, derived from most remote antiquity." And he proceeds to quote St. Ignatius, Papias, St. Irenæus, Dionysius of Corinth, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Caius of Rome and Origen (*Historia Literaria,* i.).

Dr. Lardner writes: "It is the general, uncontradicted, disinterested testimony of ancient writers in the several parts of the world—Greeks, Latins, Syrians" (*History of the Apostles,* ch. xviii.).

Whiston writes: "That St. Peter was at Rome is so clear in Christian antiquity that it is a shame for any Protestant to confess that any Protestant ever denied it" (*Memoirs*).

Pearson writes: "Since it has been handed down from almost the beginning that St. Peter preached the Gospel in Rome, and there suffered martyrdom, and since no one has ever affirmed that either Peter or Paul was crowned with martyrdom elsewhere, I think, with full security, faith may be given to this account. For who would believe that so great an Apostle could have died in such obscurity as that no one ever recorded the place of his death?" (*Minor Theological Works,* iii., 34; Vacandard, *Etudes de Critique,* iv., 3-12.)

The fact that Peter was in Rome is proved from the Sacred Scriptures, for the Epistle of St. Peter was written from Babylon, *i. e.,* Rome. Babylon, the city of iniquity, spoken of by the prophets (Isa. xxi. 9; Jer. ii. 8) was figuratively used for Rome in Apostolic times, as we learn from St. John (Apoc. xiv. 8; xvi. 19; xvii. 5; xviii. 21). In the fourth century we find both Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.,* 15) and St. Jerome (*De Viris Ill.*) declaring that St. Peter by "Babylon" means Rome.

This is admitted by fair-minded Protestants. Elliott's, *Speaker's Commentary,* thus comments on 1 Peter v. 13: "We have to remark that the city of Babylon was certainly not the seat of a Christian community; that no ancient record has the

slightest trace of St. Peter's presence or work in Chaldea; that all ancient authorities are unanimous in asserting that the later years of his life were passed in the West of the Roman Empire. On the other hand Babylon was well known in Asia Minor during the lifetime of St. John as the symbolical designation of Rome . . . Accordingly, we find an absolute consensus of ancient interpreters that there Babylon must be understood as equivalent to Rome." He then cites Thiersch, Ewald and Hilgenfeld, who held the same view.

The Fathers of the first four centuries frequently speak of the labors of St. Peter in Rome and his martyrdom there. St. Clement (*Ad Cor.*, v.) in 97; St. Ignatius (*Ad Rom.*, iv.) in 107; St. Clement of Alexandria (*In* Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, vi., 14) in 190; St. Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.*, iii., 3) in 178; the Roman presbyter Caius (*In* Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, ii., 25) in 214. Many others can be cited, such as Origen, St Cyprian, Firmilian, Arnobius, St. Epiphanius and St. Dionysius of Corinth.

Another strong proof of St. Peter's presence in Rome is drawn from the study of archæology. Professor Lanciani writes: "For the archæologist the presence and execution of St Peter and St. Paul in Rome are facts established beyond the shadow of a doubt by purely monumental evidence. There is no event of the imperial age which is attested by so many noble structures. . . When Constantine raised the monumental basilicas over their tombs on the Via Cornelia and the Via Ostiensis; when Eudoxia built the Church ad Vincula; when Damasus put a memorial tablet in the Platonia ad Catacumbas; when the houses of Pudens and Aquila were turned into Christian oratories; when the name of Nymphæ Sancti Petri was given to the springs of the Catacombs of the Via Nomentana; when Christians and pagans alike named their children Peter and Paul; when June 29th was accepted as the anniversary of St. Peter's execution; when sculptors, painters, medalists, workers in glass and enamel, and engravers of precious stones all began to produce in Rome the likenesses of the Apostles at the beginning of the second century, and continued to do so until the fall of the Empire; must we consider them all as laboring under a delusion, or as conspiring in the commission of a gigantic fraud?" (*Pagan and Christian Rome*, 135.)

Bibliography: Allnatt, *St. Peter in Rome;* Barnes, *The Early Church in the Light of the Monuments; St. Peter in Rome;* Lanciani, *Pagan and Christian Rome;* Livius, *St. Peter, Bishop of Rome;* Vacandard, *Etudes de Critique*, iv., 3-12. D. L. iii. 76-90.

What proofs can you give that St. Peter was ever Bishop of Rome?

It was not divinely revealed that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome, but it is a dogmatic fact: *i. e.*, an historical truth so certain and so intimately connected with the dogma of the primacy, that it comes under the divine, infallible teaching authority of the Church. The Vatican Council (*On the Church,* ch. 2) defined it as an article of faith that "St. Peter still lives, presides and judges in the person of his successors, the Bishops of Rome."

This fact was first denied by the Waldenses in the thirteenth century, and in the fourteenth by Marsiglio of Padua, the anti-Papal defender of the schismatic Emperor, Louis of Bavaria, against Pope John XXII. This denial came too late; it was plainly forged for a controversial purpose.

It is remarkable that none of the Eastern schismatics who seceded from Rome from the fifth to the eleventh centuries ever denied the Roman Episcopate of St. Peter. They might have done so to put forward a plausible reason for their schism, but they never dreamed of using so impossible an argument.

There are many witnesses in the early Church for the fact of St. Peter's Roman Episcopate. Their testimonies may be studied in detail, by consulting Father Livius' *St. Peter, Bishop of Rome.* We cite three of the most striking passages.

St. Irenæus (178) speaks of "that greatest, most ancient and most illustrious church, founded and constituted at Rome by the glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul, with which every church must agree" (*Adv. Hær.,* iii., 3). St. Cyprian (250) calls Rome "the Chair of Peter, and the ruling church, whence the unity of the priesthod has its source" (*Ad Cornel.,* lv.). Eusebius (315) in his History (iv., 1) states that "Linus was the first after Peter that obtained the Episcopate of the Church of the Romans."

Bibliography: C. W. ix. 374; xvi. 55.

Is there any Biblical proof that Christ made Peter the first Pope? Were not all the Apostles equal?

The Catholic Church believes that St. Peter was the chief Apostle, exercising by Christ's appointment the supreme power of governing His Church. The Vatican Council says: "If anyone says that Christ the Lord did not constitute the Blessed Peter prince of all the Apostles and head of the whole church militant; or if he says that this primacy is one of mere honor and not of real jurisdiction received directly and immediately from our Lord Jesus, let him be anathema."

On three different occasions Christ speaks of the primacy of St. Peter over the twelve Apostles.

1. After St. Peter had acknowledged His divinity, Christ promised him a reward in the following words: "Thou art

Peter and upon this rock I will build My church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven" (Matt. xvi. 18, 19).

a. The metaphor of the rock is easily understood. Christ the Rock, the Chief Corner Stone of the Church (Eph. ii. 20; Matt. xxi. 42), promises to make Peter the rock, on which His Church (1 Cor. iii. 9) is to be built. He is addressing him alone ("I say to *thee*"), not the other Apostles. Our Lord has in mind the wise man of His own parable (Matt. vii. 24). The rock foundation of a building gives it unity, strength and stability; it holds all the various parts of the building solidly together. In a society this is effected by the authority of the head, by whom unity is forever preserved.

b. Christ then gives the reason why He intends to build His Church upon the Rock, Peter, *viz.*, "that the gates of hell may never prevail against it." Whether hell means the hell of the damned or the realm of death, the meaning is obvious. The Church of Christ is to withstand forever the attacks of every foe within or without her fold (Rivington, *Authority*, xvi., 29).

c. The symbol of the keys, in the East, always implied power and authority, and the giving of the keys the transfer of that authority. Even in our day when we wish to honor a visitor of prominence we give him the keys of the city. When we sell a building, we give the keys to the new owner the day the title passes. When Eliacim was appointed over the palace in the place of Sobna, we read: "I will lay the key of the house of David upon his shoulder; and he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open" (Isa. xxii. 22; *Cf.* Apoc. i. 18; iii. 7).

"The gift of the keys," writes Lagrange, "is, therefore, an investiture of power over all the house. The owner still keeps the sovereign power, but delegates its exercise to a major-domo. . . . Christ has the keys of David (Apoc. iii. 7); He gives St. Peter the keys. St. Peter's authority, therefore, is the authority of Jesus, which He ratifies in heaven" (*Evangile selon S. Matthieu*, 328).

d. "Binding and loosing" among the Rabbis of our Lord's time meant to declare something "prohibited" or "permitted." Here it plainly means that St. Peter, the Steward of the Lord's house, the Church, has all the rights and powers of a divinely appointed steward. He does not, like the Jewish Rabbis, declare probable, speculative opinions, but he has the right to teach and govern authoritatively, with the certainty of God's approval "in heaven." The member of the Church that refuses

to obey is to be regarded as "a heathen and a publican," as Christ says in a similar passage (Matt. xviii. 17). A lawgiving power is certainly implied by these words.

2. The night before He died Jesus said to St. Peter: "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren" (Luke xxii. 31, 32). Satan had desired to try the Apostle, as once he tried the patriarch Job (i. 11, 12). Christ tells St. Peter that, although He prayed for all the Apostles (John xvii. 9), He prayed especially for him (Luke xxii. 31), that he might strengthen the others. As the Protestant commentator, Bengel, well says: "By preserving Peter, whose ruin would have meant the ruin of the others, Christ preserved them all. This whole speech of our Lord presupposes that Peter is the first of the Apostles, on whose stability or fall the less or greater danger of the others depended" (*Gnomon*, 302). Christ prophesies that St. Peter will one day say that he did not know Jesus, but not that he would deny Him as the Messias and the Son of God (Matt. xxvi. 72). Just as the "Church, therefore, is the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. iii. 15), so St. Peter is the strengthener of the faith of his brethren. The promise in St. Luke corresponds perfectly with our Lord's promise in Matthew. Simon is the security of the Church against Satan and the powers of hell in both cases; he is the solid rock on which the Church is to be built (Lagrange, *Evangile selon S. Luc*, 552).

3. After the Resurrection, Christ bestowed upon St. Peter the primacy He had twice promised. His words are: "Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me more than these? He saith to Him: Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith to him: Feed My lambs. He saith to him again: Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me? He saith to Him: Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith to him: Feed My lambs. He said to him the third time: Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me? Peter was grieved because He had said to him the third time: Lovest thou Me? And he said to Him: Lord, Thou knowest all things; Thou knowest that I love Thee. He said to him: Feed My sheep" (John xxi. 15-17).

The Vatican Council defines as an article of faith that by these words Christ "conferred upon Peter alone the jurisdiction of Chief Pastor and Ruler over all the flock."

The three-fold question of our Lord reminds Peter of his former presumption (Matt. xxvi. 33) and his three-fold denial (Matt. xxvi. 75), and tells the other Apostles that Peter's love was indeed greater than theirs. For this reason Christ conferred upon him a higher office. Peter does not boast of his love this

time, but he appeals to our Lord's Omniscience as evidence of its reality.

The symbolism is plain. Christ declared Himself the Good Shepherd (John x. 11-16) frequently foretold by the prophets (*Cf.* Ezec. xxxiv. 23; xxxvii. 24, 26; Zach. xi. 7; Jer. iii. 14; xxii. 4; Isa. xli. 11). As the divine Ruler of the whole flock, He makes Peter the ruler in His place, now that He is to leave this earth and return to His heavenly Father. Christ's supreme power of teaching, judging, and legislating for the flock is delegated to Peter, who is to teach, rule and judge the flock forever with His divine authority (Lagrange, *Evangile selon St. Jean,* 528).

Indeed the preeminence of St. Peter is suggested in many a passage in the New Testament. His name is changed at his first meeting with Christ (John i. 42), thus indicating the office of rock foundation, which was to be given him later on. He is always named first in the lists of the Apostles (Matt. x. 2; Mark iii. 16; Luke vi. 13, 14), and always regarded as their leader (Matt. xvii. 1, 23-26; xxvi. 37-40; xiv. 22; Mark v. 37; ix. 1; Luke v. 2-10; viii. 45). After the Resurrection he presides at the election of Matthias (Acts i. 22); he is the first to preach the Gospel (Acts ii. 14); he is the first to work miracles (Acts iii. 6); he is the judge of Ananias and Saphira (Acts v. 1-10); he is the first to declare the universality of the Church's mission (Acts x.), and the first to receive a pagan convert (Acts x.); he presides at the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv.).

ST. PETER THE ROCK

Does not the rock mean Christ (Matt. xvi. 18)? We read in the Bible "And that rock was Christ" (1 Cor. x. 4).

In Matt. xvi. 18 the word rock refers to St. Peter as many fair-minded Protestant commentators admit: Alford, Bloomfield, Keil, Mansel, Marsh, Rosemüller, Seifert, Thompson, Weiss and others. Thompson of Glasgow in his *Monatesseron,* 194, says: "Peter was the rock on which Christ said His Church should be built. To this the connection and the scope of the passage agree. There seems to be something forced in every other construction. . . . Protestants have betrayed unnecessary fears, and have, therefore, used all the hardihood of lawless criticism in their attempts to reason away the Catholic interpretation."

The early Fathers frequently speak of Peter as the rock.

Tertullian writes: "Peter, who is called the rock whereon the Church was to be built, and who obtained the keys of the kingdom of heaven" (*De Præs.*, 22). St. Cyprian writes: "Peter, whom the Lord chose as first, and upon whom He built His Church" (*Epis.* 71, *Ad Quintum*). We do not claim that Peter is the rock independently of Christ, but as "the rock and foundation after Christ" (Theophylact, *In Lucam*, xxii.).

With regard to 1 Cor. x. 4, many of the Fathers held that Christ in the form of an angel led the Jews through the wilderness (Exod. xxiii. 20-23). The water that flowed twice from the material rock (Exod. xvii. 6; Num. xx. 11) was provided by the Spiritual Rock, Christ. Another interpretation holds that the rock struck by Moses is called "spiritual," because it typified Christ, whose Blood flowed like the water from the rock for the salvation of men.

Christ was the Divine Founder of the Church, its Rock primarily; Peter was the rock secondarily, by divine appointment.

Does not St. Paul declare that Christ is the only foundation of the Church? "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid which is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. iii. 11)?

We may dismiss this text as irrelevant, because St. Paul is speaking of the solidity of the elementary doctrine that he preached to the Corinthians. They were as yet unfit for the more profound truths which he preached to the perfect (1 Cor. ii. 6), but still his foundation doctrine was Jesus Christ: *i. e.*, faith in His Divinity and His Redemption. "For I judged not myself to know anything among you, but Jesus Christ and Him Crucified" (1 Cor. ii. 2).

Does not St. Paul teach that all the Apostles were foundations of the Church? Why do you build it then solely on Peter (Eph. ii. 19, 20)?

They were foundations in the sense that they preached Jesus Christ, whom the prophets foretold. It is obvious that the prophets and the Apostles were not foundations in the same sense. The text reads: "You are fellow citizens with the saints, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets."

He could have styled them foundations of the Church had he so willed. St. John did so (Apoc. xxi. 14)—for they were the first infallible teachers of Christ's Gospel. Peter was the solid rock upon which they, the foundation stones, were built.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Allies, *St. Peter, His Name and Office;* Benson, *St. Peter in the New Testament;* Carson, *Some Prerogatives of Peter.*

Is not Christ called "the stone which was set at naught of you builders, which is become the Head of the corner" (Acts iv. 11)?

Yes, and rightly so, because He is the Founder of the Church, the Corner Stone of the house of the Kingdom of God. Through His Redemption we are saved, as St. Peter teaches in the very next verse. "Neither is there salvation in any other. For there is no other Name under heaven, whereby we must be saved" (*Cf.* Eph. ii. 20, 22; Matt. xxi. 42). These texts do not exclude St. Peter. St. Leo (440-461) answered this objection more than one thousand years ago. He writes: "Thou art Peter, *i. e.*, whereas I (Christ) am the inviolable Rock; I the Chief Corner Stone . . . nevertheless, thou (Peter) art also a rock, because thou art consolidated by My power so that, what belongs to Me by My power, may be common to thee by being made partaker of them with Me" (Sermon IV, *In Nat. Ord.*, ch. 2).

Does not the use of the two words *Petros* and *Petra* (Matt. xvi. 18) prove a clear difference in meaning?

Not at all. Our Lord did not speak Greek, but Aramaic, which uses the same word *Kepha* in both places. St. John tells us Peter's name, Cephas (*Cf.* 1 Cor. i. 12; iii. 22; ix. 5; xv. 5; Gal. ii. 9) was equivalent to *Petros* (John i. 42).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Lagrange, *Evangile selon S. Matthieu*, 325.

Do not the early Fathers speak of Peter's faith as the rock? Does not St. Augustine state that the rock is the confession Peter made? Do not others declare that the rock is Christ?

None of these interpretations deny that Peter is the rock foundation of the Church, as we have explained. Taken together they make the true meaning all the more clear. Christ is the original Rock on which Peter rests; Peter is the Rock or foundation of the Church; faith is the Rock of the Church, *i. e.*, Peter's faith is that which makes him the foundation of the Church. Peter's confession is the rock, inasmuch as his profession of Christ's divinity merited him the honor of being made the foundation of the Church.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Rivington, *Authority*, 29-39.

DISPUTE OF THE APOSTLES

If St. Peter was the chief Apostle why do we read that "there was a strife among them (the Apostles), which of them should be accounted the greatest" (Luke xxii. 24)?

The Apostles might have been ignorant of the primacy of Peter before the Resurrection, just as they were ignorant of the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord (Matt. xvi. 23; xx. 17-19; Luke ix. 45; xviii. 34; xviv. 25). Our Lord could have ended the dispute in a moment, had He declared that no one would be the chief or the greatest Apostle in His Church. On the contrary, He implies that there would be a ruler among them, not lording it like the pagan kings over their subjects, but making authority a means of serving the brethren. He Himself gave the example: "Even as the Son of Man is not come to be ministered to, but to minister" (Matt. xx. 28). "I am in the midst of you as one that serveth" (Luke xxii. 27).

In fact, He plainly points out that one is chief among them, for He says: "He that is *the greater* among you, let him become as the younger; and he that is *the leader,* as he that serveth" (Luke xxii. 27).

Is it not incredible that the subject Apostles should send their supreme pontiff and one of themselves on a joint mission to Samaria (Acts viii. 14)? (Puller, *Primitive Saints,* p. 117.)

It is not incredible, for Josephus tells us of a joint mission to Rome in the first century of persons of unequal rank. The Jews sent to Nero ten legates among their princes, together with their High-Priest, Ishmael, and another Jewish priest.

It was the Apostolic custom for two disciples to go together on their missionary journeys (Luke x. 1); Paul and Barnabas (Acts xi. 30; xii. 25); Paul and Silas (Acts xv. 40); Barnabas and Mark (Acts xv. 39); Judas and Silas (Acts xv. 32).

Allies says on this point: "Luke mentions Peter and John, but he sets Peter first; and in his record of what happened to Simon, John acts the second part, and it is Peter alone who teaches, commands, judges, and condemns with authority, as the head and supreme ruler. Peter alone replies to Simon, and not only so, but condemns his profaneness, enlarges upon his guilt, and solemnly declares that the gifts of God are not purchasable with money" (*St. Peter, His Name and Office,* 164).

Did not James preside at the Council of Jerusalem, and give the definite sentence? How then was Peter chief Apostle?

St. Peter, not St. James, presided at the Council of Jerusalem. The question at issue was whether the Gentiles were bound to obey the Mosaic law. Paul, Barnabas, James and the rest were present as teachers and judges, just as Bishops were present at the Vatican Council, but Peter was their head, and the supreme arbiter of the controversy, as Pius IX was in the nineteenth century.

St. Peter spoke first and decided the matter unhesitatingly, declaring that the Gentile converts were not bound by the Mosaic law. He claimed to exercise authority in the name of his special election by God to receive the Gentiles (Acts xv. 7), and he severely rebuked those who held the opposite view (Acts xv. 10). After he had spoken "all the multitude held their peace" (Acts xv. 12). Those who spoke after him merely confirmed his decision, mentioning like Paul and Barnabas the miracles wrought by God on their missionary journeys, or suggesting, like James, that the Gentiles respect the scruples of the Jewish converts, by abstaining from the things they detested (Acts xv. 20, 21).

The translation in the King James Version of *krino*, "my sentence is" (Acts xv. 19) should be "I think; I am of the opinion"; as we learn from other passages of the Acts (xiii. 46; xvi. 15; xxvi. 8). James gave no special decision on the question, but merely expressed the views that had been adopted at the meeting spoken of in Gal. ii. 6. Moreover the decree is attributed to the Council of Apostles and Presbyters, assisted by the Holy Spirit (Acts xvi. 4; xv. 28), and not to James personally.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Allies, *St. Peter, His Name and Office*, 178-183; Jacquier, *Les Actes des Apôtres*, 447-466.

ST. PAUL'S REBUKE OF ST. PETER

Did not St. Paul refuse to acknowledge St. Peter as his superior, when he "withstood him to the face" (Gal. ii. 11)?

St. Paul's rebuke of St. Peter, instead of implying a denial of his supremacy, implies just the opposite. He tells us that the example of St. Peter "compelled" the Gentiles to live as the Jews. St. Paul's example had not the same compelling power.

The duty of fraternal correction (Matt. xviii. 15) may often require an inferior to rebuke a superior in defence of justice and truth. St. Bernard, St. Thomas of Canterbury and St. Catherine of Siena have rebuked Popes, while fully acknowledging their supreme authority.

Some of the Greek Fathers thought that the *Cephas* here mentioned was not the Apostle St. Peter, but another disciple of the same name (St. Clement of Alexandria in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, i., 12). Others like St. John Chrysostom, St. Cyril of Alexandria and St. Jerome (*Comm. in Gal.*, ii., 11) held that the whole scene was pre-arranged by the Apostles, so as to settle the question decidedly. But since the time of St. Augustine (*Epis.*, xl. 3) both these views have been set aside as far-fetched and unnecessary. There was a real dissension, and a real rebuke.

The rebuke, however, did not refer to the doctrine, but to the conduct of St. Peter, as Tertullian says (*De Præs.*, 23). St. Peter had not changed the views he had himself set forth at the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 10). But at Antioch he withdrew from the table of the Gentiles, because he feared giving offence to the Jewish converts. They at once mistook his kindliness for an approval of the false teaching of certain Judaizers, who wished to make the Mosaic law obligatory upon all Christians. His action was at most imprudent, and calculated to do harm because of his great influence and authority. St. Paul, therefore, had a perfect right to uphold the Gospel liberty by a direct appeal to St. Peter's own example and teaching.

Bibliography: St. Alphonsus Liguori, *Verità della Fede*, vii., 12; Lagrange, *Epître aux Galates*, 41-45; Merry del Val, *The Truth of the Papal Claims*, iii. B. Feb., 1924.

Granted that Peter was the chief Apostle and head of the Church in the beginning, how can you prove that his power was handed down the centuries? Was there any exercise of the Papal supremacy during the first three centuries?

The Vatican Council teaches as an article of faith that the Pope is the legitimate successor of St Peter. "If any one says that the Roman Pontiff is not the successor of Blessed Peter in the primacy, let him be anathema."

The primacy of St. Peter was not a personal privilege, like the power of working miracles, but an essential part of Christ's Church, the rock on which it was built. As long as the Church was to last—till the end of the world—Peter was to reign in an unbroken succession of Bishops of Rome. The House of God

will always need its *foundation;* the House of God will always need its divinely appointed *steward;* the faithful will always need a *confirmer of the brethren,* and a *shepherd* to guide and rule them.

Some have suggested that the preeminence of the Roman Church came from the fact that Rome was the capital of the Empire. But if we consult the divine tradition which ever recognized the Bishops of Rome as the successors of St. Peter, we will never find, except in the schismatical East, the slightest allusion to this false theory. It states unanimously that the Popes held their supreme office for the sole reason that they were St. Peter's successors. That Rome's place in the Empire led to its being chosen by Divine Providence as Peter's see was to be expected.

Many of the documents of early Church history were destroyed during the pagan persecutions of the first three centuries, but ample records remain to show that the Bishops of Rome exercised the supreme power of teaching, ruling and judging. Before St. John died, Pope Clement of Rome (90-99) of his own accord wrote to the Christians of Corinth, urging concord and submission to their ecclesiastical superiors. There is no record of the Apostle John intervening, although Ephesus was easier of access than Rome. The Corinthians accepted Rome's message and legates gladly, and the Pope's letter was placed almost on a level with the Sacred Scriptures for nearly a century (Clement, *Ad. Cor.,* i., 1, 2, 44).

St. Ignatius of Antioch (117) a few years afterwards wrote a letter to the Roman Church, in which he mentions her supremacy. "She presides in the country of the Romans; she presides at the love feasts, or the charities." As Duchesne well says: "Here there is no question of the Bishop, but of the Church. Over what did the Roman Church preside? Was it merely over some other churches, or dioceses, within a limited area? Ignatius had no idea of a limitation of that kind. . . . The most natural meaning of such language is that the Roman Church presides over all the Churches" (*The Churches Separated from Rome,* 85). She not only ruled, but she taught infallibly the doctrine of Christ, for St. Ignatius adds: "You have never led astray any one; you have taught others" (*Ad Rom.,* iii.).

The Epitaph of Abercius, a Phrygian priest or Bishop of the latter half of the second century, states that "Christ, the Pure Shepherd, sent him to royal Rome to behold it, and to see the golden-robed, golden-slippered queen." This famous stele, which was presented to Pope Leo XIII on his jubilee by the Sultan of Turkey, tells in mystical language of Baptism, the Eucharist, the universality of the Church as opposed to Montanism, and of

the preeminence of Rome, which he came from afar to visit, taking "Faith as his guide."

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Batiffol, *Etudes d'Histoire,* 164; Barnes, *The Early Church in the Light of the Monuments,* 94-100. D. L. i. 66.—D. T. i. 58-66.—R. C. xii. 193.

Pope Victor (189-198) at the close of the second century summoned the Bishops of the time to come together in councils to determine the date of celebrating Easter. The Asiatics accepted the Jewish Pasch for their feast, while Rome observed it on the Sunday after the Jewish Pasch. Although the Council of Asia appealed to St. John and St. Philip as their authorities together with Papias and St. Polycarp, the Pope threatened the Bishops with excommunication, unless they abandoned their custom. Could there be a more striking evidence of his realization of his supreme authority? Who but the supreme Bishop would have dared to separate Bishops from the unity of the whole Church? No other Church ever claimed such power.

St. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, wrote in 180 his well known treatise against the Gnostics of his time. In it we find a clear assertion of the unity of the Church's teaching, and the supremacy of Rome, the guardian of the Apostolic tradition, over all other churches. He says: "It would be too long to enumerate here the series of all the churches; it suffices to point out the Apostolic tradition, the teaching that has come down to us by episcopal succession in the Church of Rome, the greatest and most ancient of all, known everywhere, and founded in Rome by the two glorious Apostles, Paul and Peter. . . . Indeed, the superior preeminence of that Church is such that every church—I mean the faithful of any country whatsoever—necessarily agrees with her, that is, every church in any country in which the Apostolic tradition has been preserved without interruption" (*Adv. Hær.,* iii., 3).

When the heretical Bishop of Antioch, Paul of Samosata, refused to leave his residence after his deposition, the case was brought before the pagan Emperor Aurelian (270-275). He decided it "most equitably, ordering the building to be given to those to whom the Bishops of Italy and the city of Rome should adjudge it" (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.,* vii., 30).

In the year 256 a conflict arose between Pope Stephen (254-257) and St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, on the question of baptisms conferred by heretics. Rome considered these baptisms valid, while Carthage declared them invalid. Despite the fact that St. Cyprian with his Bishops in Council refused to give up his custom, Pope Stephen (254-257) insisted upon the *traditional* teaching, and threatened the opposing Bishops with excommunication, as Pope Victor had done in the Easter controversy.

Neither the African Bishops, nor Firmilian, Bishop of

Cæsarea, who held similar views, denied the authority of the Apostolic See. They simply defended their opinion by arguments no one considers theologically sound to-day, falsely believing they were free to follow what they considered a disciplinary custom.

Did not the same St. Cyprian write to Pope Cornelius: "They dare set sail and carry letters from schismatics and profane persons to *the Chair of Peter, the primatial Church, whence the unity of the Church has its rise*" (*Epis.*, lix., 14). Again he wrote Pope Stephen to excommunicate Marcian, Bishop of Arles, for heresy, thus fully acknowledging his supreme authority. A liberal critic, Harnack, writes: "Cyprian recognized in the See of Rome a particular importance, because that See was the See of the Apostle on whom Christ conferred especially the Apostolic authority, to manifest thereby with perfect clearness the unity of this authority and the unity of the Church which rested thereon, and because the Church of this See had been the mother and the root of the Catholic Church spread through the world" (*Dogmengeschichte*, i., 384).

The Archbishop of Alexandria, Dionysius (195-265), was accused at Rome of heresy with regard to the Blessed Trinity. Pope Dionysius (259-268) asked him to explain his words, which he did in his reply to the Pope, and in the four books of his *Refutation and Apology* (Athanasius, *De Sent. Dion.*, 13, 18). The Pope asked him not to reject the term consubstantial, although the word did not become classical until the following century. The Archbishop, in modifying his language, showed that he was really orthodox, and thereby recognized the authority of the Bishop of Rome to call him to account.

One of the most voluminous writers of the third century was Origen of Alexandria (185-254). His many doctrinal errors were condemned at Constantinople in 543, and again at the Fifth General Council in 553. During his lifetime, however, although he had disciplinary troubles with his Bishop, Demetrius, the only Bishop who rebuked him for his doctrinal errors was St. Fabian, Bishop of Rome (236-250; *Cf.* Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, xxxvi., p. 4). Harnack admits that this proves "the voice of Rome seems to have been of special importance" (Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism*, 328).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Allies, *The See of Peter; St. Peter, His Name and Office; The Throne of the Fisherman;* Allnatt, *Cathedra Petri;* Batiffol, *Catholicism and Papacy;* Chapman, *Studies in the Early Papacy; Bishop Gore and the Catholic Claims;* Dolan, *The See of Peter; The Papacy and the First Councils;* Lattey (ed.), *The Papacy;* Merry del Val, *The Truth of the Papal Claims;* Rivington, *Authority; Dependence;* Vaughan, *The Purpose of the Papacy.* A. Q. 1886, 123; 1896, 554.—C. W. xxxv. 105, 216, 359, 495, 613.—D. July, Oct., 1893; Oct., 1894; Oct., 1897; Jan., 1904.

IS THE POPE ANTICHRIST?

Is not your Pope the Antichrist of St. Paul and St. John? Does he not wear the number 666 in his belt, the mark of the Beast (*Adventist*)?

No, the Vicar of Christ upon earth is not Antichrist, nor does he wear the number 666 in his belt. Our questioner has been misinformed by some illiterate Adventist preacher, who has borne false witness against his neighbor. The Reformers of the sixteenth century borrowed their calumy of the Pope Antichrist from the Albigenses, the Waldenses, Wyclif and Huss. On the continent Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Bucer and Beza, and in England Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley and Tyndale sponsored this absurd lie, hoping by a bitter anti-Catholic slogan to wean the people away from all consideration of the Papal claims. No non-Catholic scholar of repute to-day would dream of calling the Pope Antichrist, for the Papacy has won the respect and esteem of the world by its uncompromising defence of the divinity of Christ and His entire Gospel.

If our Lord was called Beelzebub by the anti-Catholics of His day, is it not natural to expect, as He Himself said, that His disciples and Vicar should be maligned by the anti-Catholics of all ages (Matt. x. 25).

The Biblical teaching concerning Antichrist is found in the second Epistle of St. Paul to the Thessalonians (ii. 3-10), in the Epistles of St. John (1 John ii. 18, 19, 22; iv. 3; 2 John v. 7), and in the Apocalypse (xi. 7; xiii. 1-8, The First Beast; xiii. 11-18, The Second Beast; xii. 3, The Red Dragon; xvii. 2, The Scarlet-Colored Beast; *Cf.* Dan. vii. 8, 11, 20, 21; Matt. xxiv. 24; Mark xiii. 6, 22; Luke xxi. 8; John v. 43).

While there is no Catholic tradition that requires our adopting any particular view of Antichrist, nearly all Catholic writers have *expected* a personal Antichrist, and not one of them has *excluded* the idea of a personal Antichrist (Martindale, *Antichrist,* 26). The writers of both the Old Testament and the New have particularly in mind the universal struggle between good and evil, ending at the Last Judgment with the victory of Christ over Satan.

Bibliography: Allo, *L'Apocalypse;* Maas, in *C. E.,* i., 559; Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul,* i., 78-83; Ratton, *Antichrist; The Apocalypse.* D. A. i., 146.—D. T. i., 1,361.

Does not the primacy of the Pope destroy the power of the individual Bishops?

No, it does not, for the individual bishops are successors of the Apostles, and therefore enjoy true jurisdiction within their

own territory, and to a certain extent over their own subjects. even outside their dioceses. As legislators they can enact binding statutes, and dispense from their observance. They cannot, of course, make laws counter to the laws of the Universal Church, any more than a governor of the United States can order his legislature to go counter to the Federal Government. The Bishop is also judge in his own diocese, and the source of jurisdiction in the Sacrament of Penance. His court is the court of first instance, although appeals are allowed to the higher courts of the Metropolitan and the Pope. He is also the authoritative teacher, exercising this office by his own preaching, the issuing of pastoral letters, and the controlling of the preaching of his clergy, the doctrine set forth in published works, and the teaching of his schools and seminaries.

While as far as orders are concerned, the Pope holds only an equal place with other bishops, in matters of jurisdiction he enjoys supreme, universal and immediate jurisdiction over the whole Church and every member of it. This supremacy is not given by the cardinals who elect him, but immediately by God. The Pope is the Church's supreme and infallible teacher, its supreme legislator, and its supreme judge. Peter speaks and acts through Pius XI to-day, as he spoke by Leo in the fourth General Council in 451. The proof of one's visible membership in the Church of Christ for bishop, priest or layman is submission to the divine jurisdiction of the Vicar of Christ, the Pope.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Geddes, *The Church;* Lattey, (ed.), 194-212.

Did not Pope Gregory I (590-604) repudiate the title of universal or ecumenical Bishop? Was this not a plain denial of papal supremacy?

The title *universal or ecumenical Bishop* may be used in three senses. It may mean the primacy of the Pope as Bishop of Bishops, and in this sense it was given by the Easterns to Popes Hormisdas (514-523), Boniface II (530-532) and Agapetus (535-36), although the Popes never used it themselves until the time of Leo IX (1049-54). It may refer to a Bishop who "rules a certain portion of the world inhabited by Christians," as Anastasius defined it in the ninth century. Or it may mean the claim of being the sole Bishop, all others being merely his agents.

That St. Gregory took the words in this last sense is evident from his letters to the Emperor Maurice, the Empress Constantia, and to John, the Bishop of Constantinople. He writes the Emperor: "To all who know the Gospel it is clear that by the words of our Lord the care of the whole Church was committed to Blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles. . . . Yet he was not the universal Apostle. But . . . John would be called

universal Bishop." The Popes have never assumed this title, though it has been given them, "lest all the Bishops be deprived of their due meed of honor whilst some special honor be conceded to one" (*Epis.*, v., 37). In writing to the Bishop of Constantinople, who had usurped "this new, proud and profane title," he wonders "how one, who had professed himself unworthy to be called a Bishop at all, should now despise his brethren, and aspire to be called the sole Bishop" (*Epis.*, v., 44).

Pope Gregory states the Catholic doctrine of the primacy in many passages of his letters. He calls the Apostolic See of Rome "the head of the faith," and the "head of all the churches," because "it holds the place of Peter, the Prince of the Apostles." "All Bishops," and he expressly mentions Constantinople, "are subject to the Apostolic See." It has always been the teaching of the Church that the Bishops are not mere agents of the Pope, but by divine institution true successors of the Apostles. Pope Leo XIII echoes in the nineteenth century the words of Gregory I in the seventh. He writes: "Although the power of Peter and his successors is complete and supreme, it is not the only power. He who made Peter the foundation of the Church, also selected the twelve, whom He called Apostles. Just as the authority of Peter must be perpetuated in the Roman Pontiff, so also the ordinary power of the Apostles must be inherited by their successors, the Bishops. Hence the order of Bishops pertains of necessity to the very constitution of the Church" (*On the Unity of the Church*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Mann, *Lives of the Popes*, i., 133-149.

THE FALSE DECRETALS

Did not the Popes forge at Rome a series of documents known as the False Decretals in order to have a basis for their usurped supremacy? Did not Pope Nicholas I (858-867) use them in support of his new claim to rule the other churches?

The False Decretals did not originate in Rome, but in a city of France—either Rheims or Tours—about the year 850. In view of the anarchy which followed the death of Charlemagne (800-814), the unknown compiler of these decrees sought to free the clergy from metropolitan and lay aggression. Many of these documents are authentic letters of the Popes, *v. g.*, Leo I (440-461), although ascribed to Popes living in a previous century.

They introduced nothing new in the essential government of the Church, but aimed throughout at protecting the Bishops from

the unjust accusations of lay princes, and the injustice of imperious prelates like Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims. It was precisely because they introduced no novel legislation that they were so readily and so universally accepted.

That they did nothing to enhance the supremacy of the Pope is admitted to-day by most scholars. Pope Nicholas I indeed knew of their existence, but he never used them himself. Rome, in fact, outside of one citation by Pope Adrian II (867-872) on a minor matter, utterly ignored them until the time of Leo IX (1049-1054).

Their authenticity was questioned, long before the Reformation, by Catholic theologians and canonists, Peter Comestor (1178); Godfrey of Viterbo (1180), Stephen of Tournai (1203), Nicholas de Cusa (1431), and Juan de Torquemada (1468). The Church saw the False Decretals come and go with the greatest equanimity, for she knew that the Papal claims could be proved independently of the forgeries of a well-meaning but dishonest ninth century French canonist.

Bibliography: Conway, *The False Decretals;* Davenport, *The False Decretals;* Mann, *Lives of the Popes,* iii., 135-148; Roy, *St. Nicholas I.* C. W. cv. 620.—D. A. i. 903-910.—M. Feb., 1922.

THE FABLE OF POPE JOAN

Was there not at one time a female Pope, Johanna?

No, there never was a woman Pope. This fable is mentioned first in the thirteenth century by two Dominicans, John de Mailly and Stephen de Bourbon, who placed her pontificate in 1100, and by the Papal chamberlain, Martin of Troppau, who says she was Pope in 855. It originated either in a rumor concerning a woman patriarch of Constantinople spoken of by Pope Leo IX in 1053 in a letter to Cerularius; in a medieval satire ridiculing the domination of Theodora and her two daughters in the tenth century; or in the survival of a local Roman folk-tale connected with an ancient pagan monument, discovered during the pontificate of Sixtus V (1585-1590) in a street near the Colosseum.

The legend was generally accepted during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but from the days of Æneas Sylvius, Pope Pius II (1458-1464) and Platina (*Lives of the Popes*) it has been universally rejected as unhistorical. Protestant and rationalistic scholars alike agree in rejecting it: Bayle, Basnage, Blondel, Burnet, Bochart, Cave, Chamier, Casaubon, Dumoulin, Gibbon, Gieseler, Leibnitz, Mosheim, Neander, De Thou.

Not one historian mentions the woman Pope from the tenth

to the thirteenth century, which is good evidence of her never having existed. Chronology settles the question, for the two dates assigned to her pontificate are impossible. Leo IV died July 17, 855, and was immediately succeeded by Pope Benedict III (855-858). We have coins with the images of Pope Benedict III and the Emperor Lothair, who died September 28, 855, and a charter for the Abbey of Corvey issued by Benedict III on October 7, 855. There was no interregnum between these two Popes. The other date, 1100, is out of the question, as Pope Paschal II reigned from 1099 to 1118.

Bibliography: Conway, *Studies in Church History,* 107-118; Döllinger, *Die Papstfabeln,* 7-45; Hergenröther, *Histoire de l'Eglise,* iii., 178; Mourret, *Histoire de l'Eglise,* iii., 464; Vacandard, *Etudes de Critique,* iv., 15-39. C. W. ix. 1.—D. May, 1914.—D. A. ii. 1253-1270.

THE GREAT WESTERN SCHISM

What became of the Papal succession during the Great Western Schism (1378-1415)?

We have already mentioned the Great Western Schism in discussing the unity of the Church (p. 118). We simply state here that the true succession continued through Urban VI (1378-1389) and his successors, Boniface IX (1389-1404), Innocent VII (1404-1406) and Gregory XII (1406-1415). Clement VII and his successors, Benedict XIII, Alexander V. and John XXIII were merely anti-Popes, although it was practically impossible to be sure of this fact during the schism. The true Papal succession is not broken by the claims of pretenders to that dignity, any more than the true succession to the throne of England is interrupted, because at various times pretenders to the throne have arisen.

In 1876 there was considerable doubt in these United States regarding the validity of the election of President Hayes. Suppose a civil war had broken out between Democrats and Republicans on this question. Both sides would have admitted that there was a real President elected, but they would have differed as to which one had been legitimately elected. So in the Great Western Schism. All Catholics believed that there was a real Pope; but they could not know which was the lawfully elected one. The succession went on uninterruptedly through the Roman line, and all controversy on the matter was settled by the Council of Constance in 1415 which elected Martin V (1417-1431).

Bibliography: Salembier, *The Great Schism of the West.*

GENERAL COUNCILS AND THE PAPACY

Did not the Council of Constance in 1415 teach that a General Council was superior to the Pope? How do you explain this in view of your doctrine that Rome never changes, or that General Councils never err?

The primacy of the Popes has always been the teaching of the Catholic Church. The Pope, as the Head of the Church and the chief Bishop, alone has the right to convoke a General Council, and alone has the authority to give its decrees binding force. The General Councils have always acknowledged the primacy of the Popes—Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451) in the fifth century as well as Trent (1545-1563) in the sixteenth and the Vatican (1870) in the nineteenth.

At Ephesus the Bishops assembled clearly acknowledged the primacy of Pope Celestine I (422-432). The Pope wrote to St. Cyril of Alexandria ordering him to excommunicate Nestorius if he did not repent, and sent to the Council three legates, who were to act as judges, confirming everything that St. Cyril did, as representative of the Apostolic See. He also wrote directly to the Council, declaring that he was certain they would assent to the condemnation of Nestorius which he had already pronounced. His legates were well received, and his orders obeyed to the letter. One of the legates asserted his primacy: "There is no doubt that the holy and most blessed Peter, Prince and Chief of the Apostles, received the keys of the kingdom, and that until the present time he always lives and judges in his successors."

At Chalcedon, the papal legate, Bishop Paschasius, presided in the place of Pope Leo I (440-461), and condemned Dioscorus in his name. The Council received with enthusiasm the Pope's dogmatic letter to Flavian of Constantinople, saying: "That is the faith of the Fathers, that is the faith of the Apostles . . . Peter has spoken by Leo." The Bishops finally wrote the Pope to confirm their decrees. He did so with the one exception of the twenty-eighth canon, which had been passed in the absence of his legates. He rejected it, because the Eastern Bishops falsely ascribed the primacy of the Popes to the political position of Rome, led by their desire to make the see of Constantinople superior to the other Eastern patriarchates (Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles*, ii., 287-378, 649-857).

The Council of Constance in its third, fourth and fifth sessions did erroneously declare that the Council was above the Pope, but these decrees never received the force of law in the Church, and were deliberately set aside as null and void by Pope Martin V on April 22, 1418, and by Pope Eugenius IV on July 22, 1446, as "detrimental to the rights, dignity and supremacy of

the Holy See." The Council became a General Council only in its last sessions (xlii. to xlv.) when the newly elected Pope, Martin V, presided, and when he and his successor approved it with the exception of its anti-Papal heresy.

Gerson himself admitted that his views were due "to the confused state of opinion resulting from a season of protracted schism, and that they denied the universally accepted doctrine of Papal supremacy" (*De Potes, Eccles.,* xii.), and common sense might have told him that a body without a head could not be a living organism. He and his friends were undoubtedly intent upon ending the abnormal state of affairs occasioned by the great Western Schism (1378-1417). Three Popes were claiming the Papacy, and no one knew to a certainty which was the true one. All were unwilling either to abdicate, or submit their claims to arbitration. The only possible solution of the difficulty seemed to be the submission of their claims to the decision of a Council. The great mistake of the theologians of Constance was to give their practical scheme for ending the schism the force of a dogmatic truth, applicable at all times and under all circumstances (Hefele, *ibid.,* i., 80; vii., 210). The Council of Florence in 1439 decided finally the true position of the Pope, and eradicated forever the last roots of schism. It says: "We define that the Holy Apostolic See of the Bishop of Rome possesses a primacy throughout the whole world; that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter, Prince of Apostles; that he is the true Vicar of Christ, the Head of the universal Church, and of all Christians, the Father and Teacher of all Christians; that to him was given in blessed Peter, by our Lord Jesus Christ, the fulness of power to feed, to rule and to govern the universal Church."

Bibliography: D. T. iii. 1200-1224.—T. Dec. 6, 1919.

POPE PIUS II

How could such an anti-Papalist as Æneas Sylvius, an immoral man and an immoral writer, become Pope? Was not his change of views due solely to his promotion to the Papacy?

It is true that Æneas Sylvius was Chief Abbreviator at the schismatical synod of Basle, which fought Pope Eugenius IV (1431-1447) and maintained the superiority of a General Council over the Pope. He also for a time entered the service of the anti-Pope, Felix V. It is true that his private life as a layman was not above reproach, and that he wrote many a page in the spirit of the pagan Renaissance.

But he sincerely repented of his sins, and in 1444, a year before his ordination, he most humbly begged pardon of the Pope, in a document that has come down to us, and was graciously received at the time (Pastor, *History of the Popes*, i., 340, 348). The Pope in answering him said: "Holy Mother Church is inexorable to one who denies his fault, but never refuses absolution to the penitent."

Æneas Sylvius became Pope in 1458. Seven years after he issued his famous Bull of Retraction, in which he strongly repudiated his erroneous teaching on the Papacy, and in another document condemned his erotic writings. He says: "Misled, like St. Paul, we have said, written and done much that is worthy of condemnation, and in ignorance have persecuted the Church of God and the Roman See. Therefore we now pray: Lord, forgive us the sins of our youth. . . . We are therefore obliged to imitate St. Augustine, and retract our errors. We exhort you then to give no credit to those earlier writings which oppose the supremacy of the Roman See, or contain anything not admitted by the Roman Church. . . . To St. Peter alone did the Savior give the plenitude of power; he and his lawful successors are the only possessors of the primacy. If you find in the Dialogues, in our letters, or in our other works anything in opposition to this teaching, reject and despise it. Follow that which we now say; believe the old man rather than the youth; do not esteem the layman more highly than the Pope; cast away Æneas, hold fast to Pius" (Pastor, *ibid.*, iii., 283). He had realized his error long before he became Pope, for in this very document he mentions a letter of retractation which he had sent to the Rector of the Academy of Cologne, in August, 1447.

By what right did Pope Alexander VI (1492-1503) divide the Spanish and Portuguese possessions in the New World? Was this not an unwarranted assumption of power?

Catholic Europe before the Reformation regarded the Pope as the Supreme Court of international law, just as the League of Nations is regarded to-day by its members. The aim of the Pope's Bull, *Inter Cætera*, May 4, 1493, was not, as some have pretended, to give away lands that he owned or claimed, but to mark out the limits in which the two nations, Spain and Portugal, could operate without coming into conflict. He was merely selected as arbiter, just as Pope Leo XIII was chosen arbiter by Bismarck in his dispute with Spain over the Caroline Islands in 1883.

John II of Portugal (1481-1495) was thus enabled to maintain good relations with Castile. The Pope's decision drew an

imaginary line 360 leagues west of Cape Verde, the Spaniards acquiring the right to all lands lying to the West, and the Portuguese acquiring those to the East. That is why most of the coast line of Brazil discovered in 1500 fell to Portugal, while the rest of America and the West Indies fell to Spain. The Pope's action by preventing war between the two countries, aided greatly in the work of colonization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Hergenröther, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, v., 78. D. A. i. 83.

THE ROMAN QUESTION

Why do Catholics defend the temporal power of the Popes? Did not Christ say: "My Kingdom is not of this world" (John xviii. 36)? Should not the Pope have voluntarily given up the Papal States in 1870 for the sake of a united Italy? Does not the settlement of the Roman Question imply the denial of religious liberty to non-Catholics in Italy?

The Church is indeed a spiritual kingdom, established solely for the salvation of mankind. The temporal power of the Popes which lasted for centuries, was not at all necessary for their spiritual power, because that persists of its own divine right, guaranteed as it is by the abiding presence of Christ and the Holy Spirit. The Church ruled in Christ's name with full authority in the first three centuries, while the pagan Emperors were doing their utmost to destroy it. But Catholics have always maintained that to carry on effectively their supreme, world-wide jurisdiction as Vicars of Christ, the Popes ought not to be subject to any secular prince. As Pius IX declared in 1849: "Peoples, kings and nations would never turn with free confidence and devotion to the Bishop of Rome, if they saw him the subject of a sovereign or government, and did not know him to be in possession of his full liberty. There would always arise in them a strong suspicion and a continued fear that the Pope in his acts yielded to the influence of the sovereign and the government in whose territories he dwelt. And under this pretext the decrees of the Pope would oftentimes be disobeyed" (Allocution, April 20, 1849).

The Avignon period of the Papacy (1305-1376) weakened the general confidence of Europe in the Head of the Church. Seven French Popes, surrounded by a college of dominantly French cardinals, all more or less dependent upon France, were regarded with suspicion and antagonism by all the other nations. Five hundred years later Napoleon brought Pius VII a prisoner to

France in the vain attempt to make him the pliant tool of French interests in Europe. *"Qui mange le Pape en meurt:* Who eats the Pope dies of the eating" is an old French saying, as Napoleon was to learn during his disastrous Russian campaign.

The Protestant French historian, Guizot, writes: "The union of the spiritual and the temporal power in the Papacy did not arise from the systematic development, either of an abstract principle, or of ambitious aims. Theories and ambitions may have been mixed up with it, but that which has really produced the civil power of the Popes, is necessity; an increasing, unceasing necessity. . . . The donations of Pepin and Charlemagne were nothing but the coping stones in the structure which began long before, and was supported by the good sense of the people and the favor of kings" (*L'Eglise et la Societé,* 72, 142).

The Byzantine Emperors forfeited their claims to Rome and the surrounding country, because of their inability to protect the Romans from the barbarians. It was not the Emperor of Constantinople, but Popes Leo I (440-461) and Zachary (741-752), who saved Rome from Attila, Genseric and Luitprand. From the days of Gregory II (715-731), Rome was practically independent of the Emperors and subject to the Popes (Finlay, *History of the Byzantine Empire,* 50; Hallam, *Europe During the Middle Ages,* 15). The distance from Constantinople, the interrupted communications with the Exarch of Ravenna, the constant fighting against the Goths, the Huns and the Lombards, the putting down of rebellions against the Emperor in Rome itself—all tended to turn the Pope willingly or unwillingly, into a temporal sovereign (Hodgkin, *Italy,* v., 355).

The temporal power of the Popes, consecrated by a tenure of over one thousand years, ended when the Italian troops entered Rome on September 20, 1870. Every Pope since that day—Pius IX, Leo XIII, Pius X, Benedict XV and Pius XI—have protested against the robbery of their States by Italy; first by refusing to accept the Law of Guarantees, and secondly, by remaining prisoners within the Vatican, thus preserving their dignity and their honor intact.

The Popes refused to accept the Law of Guarantees of May 13, 1871, and the money indemnity it allowed for the spoliation of the Papal States, because it was a unilateral and not a bilateral contract—an Italian law pure and simple, which a new Parliament could apply, interpret, modify and suppress at will. It in no way guaranteed the Pope's liberty and independence. The futility of the Law of Guarantees has been manifested on many an occasion by the anti-clerical liberals who held the reins of government in Italy from 1870 until the advent of the Fascist régime in 1922. We may mention the open insult of the anti-clericals in Rome during the transfer of the remains of Pius

IX from St. Peter's to St. Lawrence's Church outside-the-walls, in May, 1881, the erection of the statue of Giordano Bruno in June, 1888, the outrages of 1891, which forced Pius X to put a stop to pilgrimages to the Vatican, and the difficulty of the Papacy in maintaining personal relations with its diplomatic representatives during the late war.

There was no chance of a reconciliation between the Popes and Italy so long as the liberals were in power. With the coming of Mussolini the whole situation changed. From the very outset of his régime he determined to settle the Roman Question, and the powers he possessed as dictator gave him the opportunity that no Italian statesman, dependent upon a Parliament, could ever have had. The negotiations for both Treaty and Concordat began as early as the summer of 1926, Barone acting for the Government and Pacelli for the Pope. Over one hundred conferences were held between 1926 and 1928, the Pope himself considering every detail in the twenty-nine audiences he granted to Pacelli. The final draft was completed on November 22, 1928, and on February 11, 1929, the Treaty and Concordat were signed by Cardinal Gasparri and Mussolini.

The Treaty proper, which consists of a preamble and twenty-seven articles, establishes the independence of the Holy See. While leaving unchanged the religious freedom guaranteed to non-Catholics by the Constitution, it makes the Catholic religion the sole religion of the State, recognizes the sovereignty of the Holy See "as an inherent attribute of its nature," erects the Vatican State as free and independent, declares the person of the Pope sacred, settles the status of the Cardinals, Vatican officials and diplomatic agents, and enacts laws concerning passports, customs, property rights, etc. The Treaty ends with the Pope's recognition of the legitimacy of the dynasty of Savoy, and his solemn declaration that he is fully satisfied with the independence guaranteed him for the carrying out of his spiritual primacy. The Roman Question is finally settled.

The Concordat consists of forty-five articles, which regulate in a most generous manner every possible question that might arise between Church and State in Italy. It upholds freedom of worship and the freedom of association, sets forth in detail the rights and duties of clerics in their civil capacity, makes the Church's holydays legal holidays, recognizes the societies grouped under "Catholic Action," accepts the canon law on the Sacrament of Matrimony, insists upon religious teaching in the primary and the secondary schools, etc.

A financial convention in three articles settles the indemnity owed the Holy See for the robbery of its territory in 1870. It grants 750,000,000 lire in cash (about $37,500,000) and 1,000,000,000 lire (about $50,000,000) in Italian consols at five per

cent—a sum far inferior to the amount granted by the Law of Guarantees.

The Holy Father, in his charge to the Lenten preachers in 1929, said with regard to the small territory he had demanded for the Vatican City. "We would show in the most certain manner that no earthly cupidity moves the Vicar of Christ, but only the consciousness of that which it is impossible to yield; because such a territorial sovereignty is a condition universally recognized as indispensable to every true sovereign jurisdiction. The least amount of territory, then, that is sufficient to support that sovereignty itself; so much territory without which it cannot exist, because having nowhere to rest. . . . We are glad to see the material earth reduced to the minimum terms, which can and ought to be spiritualized by the immense, sublime, and verily divine spirituality which it is destined to sustain and serve."

In these wise words the Pope answers those unthinking bigots who keep repeating our Lord's words: "My kingdom is not of this world." It is true that the Pope is a King of a little strip of territory in Italy, but if he is King *in* this world, he is not *of* it, for he demanded his Kingship only as a means for the indispensable exercise of his spiritual office.

Bibliography: Carrère, *The Pope;* Casaca, *The Pope and Italy;* Civis Romanus, *The Pope Is King;* Dublanchy, *La Voix de Pierre;* Duchesne, *The Beginnings of the Temporal Power;* Johnson, *The Papacy and the Kingdom of Italy;* Mann, *Lives of the Popes,* i., Part. 2, 276-288; Manning, *The Independence of the Holy See;* Parsons, *The Pope and Italy;* Prior, *Is the Pope Independent?;* Williamson, *The Lateran Treaty.* C. W. xii. 844; xxv. 609; l. 213; lii. 340; lxxii. 289; lxxiv. 557; cxxix. 385.—E. T. March 3, 1929.—R. J. March 10, 1929.—S. June 29.—T. Feb. 23, March 16, 1929.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY

What do Catholics mean by the infallibility of the Pope? How can you prove it a part of the Gospel teaching?

The Vatican Council thus defined the doctrine of Papal infallibility (*On the Church of Christ,* ch. iv.): "Faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith . . . we teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra,* that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith and morals to be held by the universal Church, by the divine assistance promised him in the Blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the

Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith and morals; and that, therefore, such definitions of the Roman Pontiffs are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church."

The Pope, therefore, is infallible only:

1. When he speaks *ex cathedra, i. e.,* when he speaks officially as supreme pastor of the universal Church. He is not infallible as supreme legislator, supreme judge or supreme ruler. He is not infallible as a simple priest, local Bishop of Rome, Archbishop of the Roman Province, Primate of Italy, or Patriarch of the West.

2. When he defines a doctrine regarding faith and morals. To define a doctrine means to settle it definitely, finally, irrevocably. To omit to define a doctrine might do incalculable harm or imply culpable neglect on the part of a Pope, but it would not be inconsistent with infallibility (Fessler, *True and False Infallibility,* 43).

3. When he speaks of faith and morals, which includes the whole content of divine revelation, or the deposit of faith, as St. Paul calls it (Matt. xxviii. 20; 1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 14) It follows logically that the Pope is also infallible in judging doctrines and facts so intimately connected with revelation that they cannot be denied without endangering revelation itself Such, for example, are theological conclusions (Christ has a human body and a human soul), truths of philosophy (the notions of person, substance, the spirituality of the soul), dogmatic facts (St. Peter was Bishop of Rome; Pope Pius XI was validly elected), and disciplinary matters (the law ordering Communion under one species).

4. When he intends to bind the whole Church. "The intention of binding all the faithful must be clearly stated," as Cardinal Hergenröther says (*Church and State,* i., 86). What he might think or intend to say, but did not actually express, is not an infallible utterance (Fessler, *True and False Infallibility,* 57, 69).

Once we admit that the Church is infallible, it follows naturally that its head and mouthpiece must likewise be infallible. For if Peter and his successors, could as supreme pastors teach false doctrine, they would cease to be the rock foundation on which the Church was built; the gates of hell would prevail contrary to Christ's promise; error would be sanctioned in heaven; the faith of the brethren would not be strengthened; the flock of Christ would not be fed with the true food of divine faith (Matt. xvi. 18, 19; Luke xxii. 31, 32; John xvi. 16. 17)

The Fourth Council of Constantinople (869) taught that "in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion has ever been pre-

served free from stain"; Pope Agatho's (678-681) letter, read and approved by the Third Council of Constantinople (680), declares "that Peter's Apostolic Church has never departed from the way of truth into any error whatsoever"; of Pope Leo's (440-461) letter to Flavian, the Bishops of Chalcedon (451), said: "Peter hath spoken thus by the mouth of Leo"; the Council of Ephesus (431) calls Pope Celestine (422-432) "the guardian of the faith," who teaches right doctrine, because he is the successor of "Blessed Peter the Apostle, the head of the whole faith, and the head of the Apostles."

Of the Fathers we mention St. Augustine (354-430). In his controversy with the Pelagians he considered the Pope as the supreme arbiter in matters of faith. In a sermon that he preached at Carthage, September 23, 417, he tells us that two African Councils of Mileve and Carthage sent reports about the Pelagian heresy to Rome. "Rome has sent back," he tells us, "her rescripts," a word borrowed from the Imperial chancery, *i. e.,* her interpretations or decisions about the heresy. "The case is finished: would that the error also were done away with" Ser. cxxxi. 10; Batiffol, *Le Catholicisme de St. Augustin,* ii., 403).

Bibliography: Chapman, *The First Eight Councils on Papal Infallibility;* Lattey (ed.), *The Papacy,* ix.; Smith, *Primacy and Infallibility.* A. Q. 1893, 677.—C. W. xiv. 597—D. T. vii. 1638-1717.

How can a mere man be infallible? Is that not a prerogative of God alone?

God alone is essentially infallible, for, as the Absolute Truth, He cannot deceive or be deceived. God can, however, make the Pope infallible as His representative upon earth, in order to safeguard His divine revelation. That He has done so is proved by the Sacred Scriptures and by the history of the Church.

Does infallibility mean that the Pope can do no wrong?

It does not. Infallibility does not mean that the Pope is incapable of committing sin. He may commit sin like any other Catholic, and he is bound like any other Catholic to use the same divine means of pardon, the Sacrament of Penance. Infallibility is not a personal, but a divine, official prerogative, given by Christ to Peter and his successors to keep them from error in defining the content of the Gospel.

Are the Popes inspired like Moses or Paul when they give forth their infallible decrees?

No, they are not inspired. Inspiration means that God is the Author of the sacred books (*Cf.* p. 64). Infallibility means a divine assistance keeping the Pope's utterances from error, so that all ages may be guaranteed the true Gospel. It is not the discovery of new truths, but the guardianship of the old truths of the divine deposit of faith.

If Peter were infallible, why did he deny the Savior (Matt. xxvi. 70; Mark xiv. 68-72)?

The infallible primacy was not given to St. Peter until after the Resurrection (John xvi. 16), and, moreover, infallibility has no reference to the personal errors or sins of individual Popes. It is noteworthy that St. Mark's Gospel, which is the teaching of St. Peter, emphasizes more than the other three Gospels, the human weaknesses and sins of the chief Apostle. In his humility St. Peter records to the utmost detail his triple denial of Jesus, while at the same time he altogether omits the great promise recorded by St. Matthew (xvi.).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: McNabb, *The New Testament Witness to St. Peter.*

Does not your infallible Pope make wrong right by his power of dispensation?

He does not. A dispensation is a relaxation of a law in a particular case, granted by a legislator for good and sufficient reasons. The law itself still remains in force, although a particular individual is freed from observing it. The law of Friday abstinence for example, is thus set aside by the Pope for Spaniards, because of their old-time crusading against the Turks, and by a Bishop in his diocese on March 17 in honor of a saint like St. Patrick.

The Pope can dispense in all church laws, even if they have been passed by a General Council, because he is the supreme head of the Church. He cannot dispense in the natural and the divine law. Pope Clement VII (1523-1534) refused Henry VIII's application for divorce, because he was validly married to Catherine of Aragon. The subservient Protestant Archbishop Cranmer was not so scrupulous. Pius VII (1800-1823) refused Napoleon's request for his brother Jerome's divorce, because he had been validly married to Miss Patterson, a Protestant, of Baltimore.

In 1525 Luther dispensed himself from his vows to marry a nun, Catherine von Bora, although such a marriage was forbidden by both the Canon Law and the laws of the Empire. He also granted a dispensation for bigamy to Philip of Hesse in

1539, although this was forbidden by both the State and the divine law (Grisar, *Luther*, ii., 187; iv., 13-79).

POPE LIBERIUS

How could Pope Liberius (352-366) be infallible, when we know that he subscribed to an heretical Arian Creed, and broke communion with Athanasius, the great defender of the Nicene Creed?

Papal infallibility does not refer to the personal errors or sins of individual Popes. The Pope is infallible only when he teaches the whole flock of Christ *ex cathedra* on a question of faith and morals. Pope Liberius was at the outset of his reign an ardent friend and supporter of St. Athanasius, and a firm defender of the faith against the Arian Emperor Constantius (337-361). For that very reason he was seized at Rome by the prefect Leontius, and taken to the court at Milan. His refusal to deny the faith of Nice, so dramatically described by Theodoret (*Hist. Eccles.*, ii., 16), led to his being exiled to Berea in Thrace. At the end of two years, longing to return to Rome, he signed, *not an heretical Arian Creed*, but the compromise formula of the Third Council of Sirmium. This contained no direct attack upon the orthodox faith, although it purposely omitted the *omoousios* of Nice, which was represented to the Pope as a cloak covering the heresies of Sabellius and Photinus. Liberius added a positive declaration, safeguarding the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father (Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles*, i., 908-928). It was an act of weakness, indeed, that went counter to his strong attitude shown at Milan two years before, but St. Athanasius himself declared that Liberius' signature was forced from him under threat of death (*History of the Arians*, xli.).

Whether the letters of Liberius recorded in the *Fragments of Hilary* are authentic (Amann, Duchesne, Feder) or spurious (Hefele, Saltet, Savio, Jungmann, Stilting) is an open question among Catholic historians. It is certainly remarkable that many of the Fathers and Popes of the fourth century speak of Liberius in the highest terms, praising both his holiness and his orthodoxy, *viz.*, St. Ambrose (*De Virginibus*, iii., 1), St. Basil (*Epis.*, 263, 3), Pope Siricius (*Epis.*, i., 1), Pope Anastasius (Letter to Venerius of Milan), etc.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Batiffol, *La Paix Constantinienne*, 462; Chapman, *R. E.*, Jan., July, 1910; Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles*, i., 908-928; Savio, *La Questione di Papa Liberio*. A. Q. 1883, 529.—C. W. xxxviii. 160.—D. A. ü. 1842.—D. T. ix. 631-659.—E. xxv. 360; xxvii.

POPE HONORIUS AND THE SIXTH GENERAL COUNCIL

Does not the condemnation of Pope Honorius as a heretic by the Sixth General Council in 681 prove that the Bishops of that time had no idea whatever of Papal infallibility?

It proves nothing of the kind. The two letters of Pope Honorius to Sergius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, did not define any doctrine, as he himself expressly states in at least four different passages. He uses language which shows clearly that he failed to recognize the latent heresy of his subtle correspondent, but which can be understood in a perfectly orthodox sense. As Rivington well says: "Honorius discountenanced the expression 'two energies,' which he applied to *contrariant* wills in our Lord's *Human Nature,* whilst really Sergius and his followers were using it of the separate Natures of our Lord, in which sense it was vital truth" (*Dependence,* 81). Even non-Catholic historians have admitted that Honorius was not a heretic. Bury, for example, writes: "Honorius uses the expression 'one will,' and yet we need not regard him as a Monothelite. . . . Nor need we reject as not genuine (as Baronius falsely did) the acts of the Sixth General Council which condemned Honorius; it was for the imprudent economy of silence that he was condemned" (*The Later Roman Empire,* ii., 252).

When Leo II (682-683) confirmed the decrees of the Sixth General Council, he also anathematized Honorius, not for teaching the Monothelite heresy, but for his negligence in "permitting the immaculate faith to be stained"; or, as he writes again to the Bishops of Spain, "for not having extinguished the flame of heretical teaching, as became the Apostolic authority, and for fostering it by his negligence" (Grisar, *Kirchenlexicon,* vi., 255).

But even if we grant that Pope Leo II and the Council condemned Honorius in his own person as a heretic (Chapman, *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius,* 114-116; Amann, in *D. T.*, vii., 121), this, as Cardinal Newman pointed out, is "inconsistent with no Catholic doctrine" (*Difficulties of Anglicans,* ii., 317). Cardinal Hergenröther thus summarizes the facts in the case: "Pope Honorius may be reproached with having encouraged error indirectly by not proceeding against it with timely vigor; but it cannot be said that he defined error, *which alone would tell against the dogma.* . . . A Pope is not infallible in proceedings such as those of Honorius, who contributed unintentionally to the increase of heresy by not issuing decisions against it. His letters to Sergius contain no decision, neither do they contain any false doctrine. No decision of his was or

could be condemned as false; otherwise the Sixth Council would have contradicted itself, for (in accepting the letter of Pope Agatho) it recognized that the Holy See had at all times the privilege of teaching the truth" (*Church and State,* i., p. 83).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Chapman, *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius;* Hefele, *Hist. des Conciles,* iii., Part 1, 343, 347-364, 376-387, 392-397, 515-538; Mann, *Lives of the Popes,* i. 330-345; Pennachi, *De Honorii Causa.* A. Q. 1882, 162; 1894, 82.—D. July, 1868; Jan., 1869; April, 1870; July, 1872.—D. A. ii. 514-519.—D. T. vii. 93-132.

POPE ZACHARY AND THE ANTIPODES

Did not your infallible Pope, Zachary (741-752), plainly err in condemning Virgilius for teaching the existence of the antipodes?

No, there is no record anywhere of any such condemnation. All we know about the question is contained in the following letter (*Epis.* 80) of Pope Zachary to St. Boniface. He writes: "I understand from your letter that Virgilius (I do not know whether he is a priest or not) has been acting maliciously against you, because you showed that he had wandered from true Catholic teaching, trying to make enmity between you and Odila, Duke of Bavaria. Nor is it true, as he says, that he has been absolved by me so that he might obtain the diocese of the deceased bishop, who was one of the four that you consecrated in Bavaria. If it be true, moreover, that he teaches that beneath the earth there is another world and other men, call a council, excommunicate him, and if he be a priest, deprive him of his dignity. We have, however, ourselves written to the Duke about Virgilius, and sent a letter to the latter, summoning him to appear before us, that he may be condemned, *if, after a careful examination, he be found to err in his teaching.*"

If arguing from the rotundity of the earth, Virgilius inferred the existence of the antipodes, he was merely following in the footsteps of St. Hilary (*In Psal.* xxxii.), and Origen (*De Princip.,* ii., 3, 6), and would not have been condemned. If, on the contrary, he held that the antipodeans were an entirely different race of men, not descended from Adam, he would have been rightly condemned, as that conclusion is opposed to the Church's teaching on the redemption of all men by our Savior.

Some scholars identify Virgilius with Ferghil, the famous Irish missionary of Carinthia, who became Bishop of Salzburg in 768 (Healy, *Ireland's Schools,* 566), but others deny this (Mann, *The Lives of the Popes,* i. Part 2, 248). The Church

never condemns a scientific theory as such, but only when its advocates falsely deny in its name a dogma of the Catholic faith. She left the scientific question open, allowing St. Hilary and Origen to defend the existence of the antipodes, which St. Augustine (*De Civ. Dei,* xvi., 9) and Lactantius (*Instit.,* iii., 24) denied.

Bibliography: Barthélémy, *Erreurs et Mensonges Historiques,* i. 209-285.

THE CRUSADES

Were the Popes infallible when they ordered Europe to exterminate the Moslems in the medieval crusades, promising heaven to all who died fighting the infidels? Were not the Crusades mere marauding expeditions, undertaken for gain and conquest under the semblance of piety? Were not all the Crusades utter failures?

The infallibility of the Pope is not involved in their encouragement of the crusades against the Moslems. The Popes are infallible only when they teach the Gospel of Christ *ex cathedra.*

Answering the appeals of the Emperor of Constantinople and the Christians of the East, the Popes, as heads of a united Christendom, ordered Europe to undertake a crusade against the Moslems, who had profaned the holy places of Palestine, and massacred and enslaved thousands of native and visiting Christians. Pope Urban II, in his speech at the Council of Clermont, November 27, 1095, did not promise heaven to every combatant, but freed from canonical penalties all who took the cross "from motives of earnest and sincere devotion." An Indulgence was granted, *i. e.,* a remission of the punishment due forgiven sin, to every crusader who "died truly penitent" (Alzog, *Church History,* ii., 250).

It is perfectly true that some crusaders were actuated by motives of glory and of gain. Some of the nobles hoped to carve out a princedom in the East; some merchants made fortunes in transporting the troops and selling them supplies; some peasants were anxious to escape from the burdens of serfdom. But the main body was inspired by religious motives; to free the sepulchre of Christ from profanation, and to succor their persecuted brethren. The word "crusade" even to our day has always been associated with a high ideal of service for the brethren.

Europe owes the Popes a debt it can never repay for their

fostering of the crusades in a peculiarly critical time. They prevented Europe from becoming Mohammedan, and kept the Moslems busy at home for four centuries. Therefore Europe had ample time to develop the sense of nationality before Constantinople finally fell in 1453.

While the crusades failed of their immediate objective, they furthered the economic, social, and political good of Europe as a whole. They strengthened the power of the Papacy, stopped many a European conflict, hastened the decline of feudalism, developed the national spirit, encouraged foreign commerce with the East, favored the growth of the cities of Italy and Western Europe, and aided the thirteenth century's great renaissance in philosophy, literature and art. A great impulse was given to foreign missions in Persia, India, China and Tibet, and Asia was opened up to the West as never before in history.

Bibliography: Brehier, *l'Eglise et l'Orient au Moyen Age; Cambridge Medieval History,* v., 265-333; Mourret, *Histoire de l'Eglise,* iv., 238-264; Paulot, *Urban II;* Stratmann, *The Church and War.* C. E. iv. 543-557.—D. A. i. 819-827.

ALEXANDER VI

How could an immoral and worldly Pope like Alexander VI (1492-1503) be infallible? Are not the attempts of Catholic historians to whitewash him palpably dishonest?

Infallibility, freedom from error in declaring to the world the Gospel of Christ, and *impeccability,* freedom from sin, are two totally different things. While we naturally expect the Popes to be of the highest moral character,—and most of them have been,—the official prerogative of infallibility has nothing whatever to do with the Pope's personal goodness or wickedness.

Our Lord told the Jews that the personal unworthiness of the Scribes and Pharisees in no way nullified their true teaching. "All things whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do; but according to their works do ye not" (Matt. xxiii. 3). The notion that a temporal or an ecclesiastical superior loses his authority whilst he is in the state of mortal sin, was an error of Wyclif, condemned by the Church in the fourteenth century.

It is true that in the latter half of the nineteenth century certain Catholic writers tried to whitewash Alexander VI, *viz.,* Bernacchi, Chantrel, Leonetti, Nemée, Ollivier and others. But it is not fair to style them dishonest, for a Catholic naturally feels called upon to defend the honor of the Pope, as any true man feels bound to defend his mother's good name. Call them

unscholarly, if you will, or ignorant, but remember that we hold with Pope Leo XIII: "The Church has no need of any man's lie." The most scholarly Catholic historian of the Popes, Ludwig Pastor, grants that Alexander lived the immoral life of the secular prince of his day, both as Cardinal and as Pope (*History of the Popes*, v., 363; vi., 140); that he obtained the papacy by the rankest simony (*Ibid.*, v., 385); and that he brought his high office into disrepute by his unconcealed nepotism and lack of moral sense (vi., 139). He frees him, however, from the calumnious charges of incest and poisoning (iv., 135).

We must not forget that there was a Judas among the Apostles, and that our Lord prophesied that tares would grow up with the wheat until the Last Day (Matt. xiii. 24-30). It is true that the personal holiness of priest or Pope is helpful as an example to non-Catholics and an encouragement to the faithful. But "just as the intrinsic worth of a jewel is not lessened by an inferior setting, so the sins of a priest cannot essentially affect his power of offering Sacrifice, administering the Sacraments, or transmitting doctrine. . . . Even the supreme high-priest can in no way diminish the value of that heavenly treasure which he controls and dispenses, but only as a steward. The gold remains gold in impure as in pure hands" (*Ibid.*, vi., 14).

Bibliography: Hergenröther, *Hist. de l'Eglise*, iv., 661-668. A. Q. 1878, 321.—C. E. i. 289.—C. W. lxviii. 499.—D. April, 1896.—D. A. i. 81.—D. T. i. 723.—M. April, 1925.—R. Q. ix. 466; xi. 181; xxix. 147.

ST. JOAN OF ARC

How could one infallible Pope, Eugenius IV (1431-1447) condemn Joan of Arc (1412-1431) to be burned as a witch, while another Pope, Benedict XV, declares her a saint in 1919?

Pope Eugenius IV knew nothing of the trial and condemnation of St. Joan of Arc by the scoundrel Bishop Cauchon of Beauvais, for a month before her death he ignores it in a letter to his legate in France, Cardinal de Sainte-Croix, asking him to bring about peace between the Kings of France and England (Raynald, *Annales Eccles.*, 1431). It is true that the Maid of Orleans appealed to the Pope during her trial, but her unjust judges, under English influence and in English pay, denied her appeal, knowing to a certainty that Rome would recognize at once the invalidity of their mock trial.

St. Joan of Arc was captured before Compiègne by the

bastard of Wandonne, a vassal of John of Luxembourg, who sold her to the English for about $100,000 (550,000 francs). The English regent, the Duke of Bedford, acting for his ten year old nephew, Henry VI, ordered Cauchon, the Bishop of Beauvais, to try her for heresy and witchcraft, declaring that even if she were acquitted, "it was his intention to take back and regain possession of the said Joan." It was against international law to put St. Joan to death for having defeated the English in battle; they had no alternative but to hold her for ransom, or keep her a prisoner until the end of the war. To have her condemned by an ecclesiastical tribunal, all the members of which were all highly paid political partisans, would restore the confidence of the English soldiers, and compromise the French King, Charles VII, as an accomplice of "a disciple of Satan, and an imp of hell."

Bishop Cauchon and his infamous judges found no difficulty in declaring St. Joan guilty of every conceivable crime—"contempt of her parents, presumption, lying, superstition, despair and attempted suicide, bloodthirsty passion, diabolism, idolatry, heresy and schism." They next staged a travesty of a public adjuration, so that immediately after they might make her innocent and necessary assumption of male attire in prison the basis of a charge of relapse into heresy—which implied the stake. That they were pronouncing judgment according to orders received and paid for is evident from the fact that the judges received letters of indemnity from the King of England on June 12, 1431!

Nineteen years later, when the English had been driven from France, the ungrateful Charles VII, who had deserted St. Joan in her hour of trial, suffered remorse of conscience, and signed a warrant, ordering a trial of rehabilitation (February 14, 1450). Five years later, November 5, 1455, the revision proceedings were opened in Paris, with the approval of Pope Calixtus III. The sentence was declared null and void on every count, the following illegalities being proved to the hilt, *viz.*, that the presiding judge was her mortal enemy, and therefore should not have been allowed to preside; that all evidence favorable to the accused was purposely suppressed; that she was illegally detained in a lay prison before and after judgment; that she was refused an advocate, although a minor; that her examinations were utterly unfair and tricky; that the questions proposed to her were unduly obscure and intricate; that false counsel was given her by pretended friends, the better to bring about her death sentence; that the summary of the twelve articles was falsified, and never submitted to her; that her appeal to the Pope was disallowed, while her judges falsely stated that she was unwilling to submit to the Church; that a pretended adjuration was substituted for the

six-line paper submitted to her; that the second hasty trial was illegal and based on false pretences; that she never was condemned by the civil judge, etc. The annulment of St. Joan's unjust sentence was declared solemnly at Rouen, July 7, 1456, a sentence confirmed in our days by Leo XIII, Pius X and Benedict XV, who in turn declared her venerable, blessed and a saint.

Bibliography: Ayroles, *La Vraie Jeanne d'Arc;* Dunand, *Etudes Critiques sur l'Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc; Lives,* by Antony, Belloc, De Julleville, Lynch, O'Hagan, Maxwell-Scott, Taylor, Vaughan and Wyndham. C. W. lv. 629, 802; lvi. 193; lix. 251.—D. A. ii. 1212-1253.—M. Jan., 1922.—R. J. May 25, 1929.

THE CONDEMNATION OF GALILEO

Were Popes Paul V (1605-1621) and Urban VIII (1623-1644) infallible, when they condemned Galileo for holding a true scientific theory? Did they not declare that the Copernican theory was "false, heretical, and contrary to the Word of God"? Did they not torture and imprison Galileo in the dungeons of the Inquisition for not sharing their erroneous views? Did not Galileo openly defy the Inquisitors, saying: *"E pur se muove*— but it does move?" Does not the Galileo case prove your Church's enmity to science, and did not his condemnation hinder the progress of scientific research?

Catholics readily grant that Popes Paul V and Urban VIII, together with the Cardinals of the Index (1616), and the Inquisition (1632), who rendered their judgments in the Popes' names, were mistaken about the truth of the Copernican theory. A careful study, however, of the decrees they issued proves clearly that they were not infallible pronouncements. There is no question in either of them of any *ex cathedra* teaching, or of any intention to propose a doctrine to be held by the universal Church.

The decree of 1616 merely prohibits all books that teach the Corpenican theory. It does not command the faithful to hold the Ptolemaic theory as true, and denounce the Copernican theory as false. It is, therefore, evidently a disciplinary decree, prescribing WHAT ONE MUST DO, AND NOT WHAT ONE MUST BELIEVE. It is true that the reasons that prompted the Pope and the Cardinals to pass the decree were doctrinal, but these reasons never form part of the decree itself. Even in an infallible decision they may be considered erroneous, as all

theologians teach. Before 1854 the Popes had issued several disciplinary decrees concerning the Immaculate Conception, with the idea of impressing this dogma upon the minds of the faithful; but no one ever dreamed of considering these decrees infallible.

The decree of the Inquisition (1632) is even more clearly disciplinary in scope. It is simply an official declaration of the guilt of Galileo, and the punishment decreed for his disobedience.

The reasons again were doctrinal, inasmuch as they tried him for what they considered heretical opinions. But the reason of their condemnation does not in itself constitute an article of faith.

The form in which both decrees were formulated proves clearly that they were not infallible pronouncements. As the Abbé Vacandard well says: "In a definition *ex cathedra,* it is the Pope who speaks in person; he may, if he choose, ask the views of the Congregations, but their opinion is regarded only as a mere consultation; the sentence, properly speaking, is his own work. In the trials of 1616 and 1632, the Popes *order,* but the Congregations *act; it is they who pronounce the sentence.* If, therefore, infallibility be an incommunicable prerogative, it is manifest that their decision cannot be infallible" (*Etudes de Critique et d'Histoire,* i., 359).

It is certain that neither in Galileo's time, nor in the period immediately following, can one theologian or scholar be found who considered the two decrees condemning Galileo infallible. On the contrary, many may be cited who plainly assert that they were not.

Cardinal Bellarmine wrote, April 12, 1615, to Father Foscarini: "I wish to say that if ever the Copernican theory be really demonstrated, we must then be more careful in explaining those passages of the Scriptures which appear contrary thereunto. We must then say that we do not understand their meaning, rather than declare a thing false which has been proved to be true. But I do not think that such a demonstration will ever be made."

In 1643, Gassendi, a friend of Galileo, wrote: "I do not consider their decision an article of faith. I do not believe that the Cardinals have so declared it, nor that their decrees have been promulgated and received by the whole Church" (*De Motu Impresso,* iii., 471).

The Jesuit, Riccioli, wrote in 1651: "As in this matter there has been no definition by the Sovereign Pontiff, nor by a Council directed or approved by him, it is by no means of faith that the sun moves and that the earth is immovable, at least in virtue of the decree" (*Almagestum Novum,* i., 52).

Bishop Caramuel of Lyons (1651) says in his *Theologia Moralis Fundamentalis:* "What would happen if scholars were one day to demonstrate the truth of the Copernican theory?" and he

replies: "In that case the Cardinals would allow us to interpret the words of Josue x. as metaphorical expressions" (i., 273).

We must not forget that the scientists of the day were just as bitter against Galileo as the theologians, for as a body they accepted without question the Ptolemaic theory, and were rightly convinced that Galileo had not adduced a single scientific proof for his novel thesis. The only three scientific arguments that he did bring forward, based as they were on the phenomena of the tides, the movement of the solar spots, and the apparent movement of the planets, either proved nothing at all in favor of the Copernican theory, or were in absolute contradiction to the facts. As the astronomer Laplace put it, Galileo defended his views only by proofs from analogy. Such proofs have undoubtedly a real value, but they do not afford any demonstrative proof. Galileo was ignorant of many facts that school children know to-day, *viz.*, the phenomena of aberration, the depression of the earth at the poles, the variation of the pendulum according to latitude and the like.

Did the condemnation of Galileo hinder the progress of scientific studies in Europe? That it retarded for a time the special researches that were one day to make the Copernican theory morally certain, we readily admit, but that it hindered the general progress of science is absolutely false. The Italy of that time fairly swarmed with scientists and scientific academies. Jauguey writes: "At Florence Prince Leopold dei Medici, later on Cardinal, founded the Academy of the Cimento to foster the natural sciences, especially the study of astronomy. This institution did not last long, but it included among its members Rinaldini, Oliva and Borelli. At Bologna, a pontifical city, were two famous mathematicians, Ricci and Montalbani; the Jesuit Riccioli, the author of the *Almagestum;* the Jesuit Grimaldi, who discovered the diffraction of light; Cassini, who later on was to make the Paris observatory famous; Castelli, Davisi, and a number of other scholars. In the same city, Mezzavacca published his *Ephémerides Astronomiques.* At Rome Cassini discovered the satellites of Saturn; Megalotti studied the comets, and Plati made his remarkable discoveries on the eclipses of the sun" (*Le Procès de Galilée,* 112).

It is now universally admitted that although Galileo was threatened with torture, he escaped it because of his age, and through the influence of his many Roman friends. The only modern author who holds that Galileo was really tortured bases his opinion upon an arbitrary and false rendering of the words *esame rigoroso* (Wohlwill, *Ist Galileo Gefoltert Worden?*). The acts of the trial, which this writer did not possess when he wrote in 1887, are utterly silent on this matter, nor did Galileo or his friends ever allude to it.

When Galileo came to Rome for his trial, he was not kept in the loathsome dungeons of the Inquisition, as some controversialists have falsely stated, but he resided first in the beautiful Villa Medici of his friend Niccolini, and afterwards, during the interrogatories, in the treasury apartments of the Inquisition, where three large rooms were placed at his disposal.

No scholar to-day admits the fable of Galileo's *E pur se muove*, which first saw the light in the unreliable *Querelles Litteraires* of the Abbé Irailh in 1761. The records of the trial present Galileo as most submissive throughout. The very day of his condemnation to the prison of the Inquisition, the Pope commuted this penalty, assigning as his prison the home of his friend Niccolini. After visiting another devoted friend, Cardinal Piccolomini of Siena, for five months, Galileo retired to his own villa of Arcetri, near Florence. He continued his studies undaunted, and was visited by scholars from all parts of the world. The Pope continued to grant him the pension of one hundred crowns, which he had given him since 1630, and on his deathbed in 1642 sent him the Apostolic Benediction.

The Galileo case was providential, because it taught churchmen the folly of too hasty a resort to ecclesiastical censures. The theologians of the day who urged the Holy See to condemn Galileo, were led by a high motive,—to defend, as they thought, a truth of divine revelation. They were right in holding that, as a general law, Scriptural texts are to be interpreted in their literal sense; they were wrong in forgetting the wise teaching of both St. Augustine and St. Thomas, that in describing the phenomena of nature, the Bible speaks according to appearances.

Bibliography: Aubanel, *Galilée et l'Eglise;* Berti, *Il Processo di G. Galilei;* Bouquard, *Galilée;* H. de l'Epinois, *La Question de Galilée;* Favaro, *Galileo e l'Inquisizione* (a critical edition of the trials and the decrees); Grisar, *Galileistudien;* Müller, *Der Galilei Processz;* Schanz, *Galileo und sein Procesz; The Bibliographia Galileiana,* published in Rome in 1896 by Favaro and Carli, contains a list of 2,108 books dealing with Galileo; Von Gebler, *Die Acten des Galileischen Procesz.* A. Q. 1882, 85.—C. W. viii. 321, 433.—D. A. ii. 147-192.

THE SUPPRESSION OF THE JESUITS

If you claim that the Popes are infallible, how can you reconcile the contradictory decrees of Clement XIV suppressing the Jesuits, July 21, 1773, and Pope Pius VII restoring them, August 7, 1814?

The Papal Briefs suppressing and restoring the Jesuits are mere disciplinary and administrative measures, that must be

judged on their merits. The Pope is not infallible as supreme legislator and judge, but only as supreme teacher of faith and morals. He has a perfect right to institute, suppress and restore any religious order, but one need not be a Jesuit to consider the action of Clement XIV imprudent and unjust.

The Jesuits had been expelled from Portugal in 1759, from France in 1764, from Spain and Naples in 1767, because the Bourbon princes were jealous of their influence and covetous of their possessions. They brought every possible political pressure to bear upon the Pope, who, once Maria Theresa deserted their cause, finally agreed to suppress them.

Alzog, in his *Church History*, thus speaks of the Brief of Suppression: "Clement XIV would have shown himself at once more prudent and more just had he said to the Jesuits what Pius IX did on a similar occasion in 1848. 'In many countries,' said he, 'they are not willing to tolerate you, or have you remain. Very good, then; withdraw from persecution for the present, and wait the return of better days.' Had he done this he would not have given a quasi-indorsement to *charges that never were proved*" (iii., 570).

Outside of Prussia and Russia, "the Jesuits died without a murmur, and in this silence they were true to their lifelong training. . . . They proved to the world the solidity of virtue that reigned throughout the Order, and showed that their doctrine of 'blind obedience'—was not a matter of mere words. . . . They had preached sermons in every part of the world, but never one like this" (Campbell, *The Jesuits*, 551, 552).

In his Bull of Restoration, Pius VII wrote that "the Catholic world unanimously demands the reestablishment of the Society of Jesus," and he adds: "I would consider myself guilty of a grievous sin in the sight of God, if I did not answer this world-wide appeal."

Bibliography: A. Q. 1888, 696.

Does not your teaching of infallibility give the Popes to-day the power they exercised in the Middle Ages of deposing sovereigns, and freeing subjects from their allegiance?

The deposing power exercised by the Popes in the Middle Ages has nothing whatever to do with the dogma of infallibility. Pope Pius IX answered this objection in a letter to the Roman Academy, July 20, 1871. He said: "This right has without doubt been exercised by the Supreme Pontiffs from time to time in crucial circumstances; but it has nothing to do with Papal infallibility, neither does it flow therefrom, but from the authority of the Pope. Moreover, the exercise of this right in

those ages of faith, which regarded the Pope as the Supreme Judge of Christendom, and recognized the great advantages of his tribunal in the great contests of peoples and of sovereigns, was freely extended by public jurisprudence and the common consent of nations to the most important interests of States and their rulers. But altogether different are the conditions of the present time; and malice alone can confound things so diverse, namely, the infallible judgment concerning the truths of divine revelation, with the right which the Popes exercised in virtue of their authority, when the common good demanded it."

In the days of a united Christendom the deposing power of the Popes was a democratic principle, defending the people from the tyranny of unworthy rulers like Henry IV of Germany, deposed by Gregory VII in 1079. Our Declaration of Independence voiced the same theory in the eighteenth century when it proclaimed: "We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in general council assembled . . . do solemnly publish and declare that these United Colonies . . . ARE ABSOLVED FROM ALL ALLEGIANCE TO THE BRITISH CROWN, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved."

No Pope to-day would dream of exercising the deposing power, because, as Pius IX well said, modern conditions are altogether different. In medieval times, a united Christendom willingly granted the Popes this power for the general good.

Do not forget, however, that the principle of a religious qualification for sovereignty is still maintained by some nations even to this day. The King of England, for example, must be a member of the Protestant Church by Law Established, even though he rule over an Empire, the vast majority of which is Pagan, Mohammedan, Jewish and Catholic. According to English law, he would be deposed at once, were he to become a Catholic, a Jew or a Mohammedan.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: D. April, 1895; Oct., 1907.

CATHOLICS AND CIVIL ALLEGIANCE

If the Pope were to command Catholics in purely civil matters to be disloyal to their country, would Catholics be bound to obey him?

They certainly would not be obliged to obey him. As Cardinal Gibbons wrote: "The Pope will take no such action we know, even though it is part of the Catholic faith that he is

infallible in the exercise of his teaching authority; but were he to do so, he would stand self-condemned, a transgressor of the law he himself promulgates. He would be offending not only against civil society, but against God, and violating an authority as truly from God as his own. Any Catholic who clearly recognized this, would be bound not to obey the Pope; or rather his conscience would bind him absolutely to disobey, because with Catholics conscience is the supreme law, which under no circumstances can we ever lawfully disobey" (*A Retrospect of Fifty Years,* 227).

There are many instances in Church history of the opposition of Catholic nations to the Popes on purely political grounds, even when they acknowledged fully the Pope's supremacy in things spiritual. When Pius V excommunicated Elizabeth in 1571, Charles IX of France, Philip II of Spain, and the Emperor Maximilian II disregarded the Bull, and the English Catholics concluded that what the great powers might do, they also were allowed. While the Bull plainly taught the Tudor Catholics that to attend the Protestant church at Elizabeth's command was to reject Catholicism, it failed to win them from their loyalty. The very martyrs to her penal laws frequently on the scaffold announced their loyalty to her (Pollen, *English Catholics in the Reign of Elizabeth,* 155-295).

How can Catholics give the United States an undivided allegiance, when they are subjects of a foreign power?

Because their allegiance to the Pope is confined to things spiritual, whereas their allegiance to the State is limited to temporal affairs. As Pope Leo XIII says: "The Almighty has appointed the charge of the human race between two powers, the ecclesiastical and the civil; the one being set over divine, the other over human things. Each in its kind is supreme; each has fixed limits within which it is contained, limits which are defined by the nature and special object of the province of each, so that there is, we may say, an orbit traced out within which the action of each is brought into play by its own native right. But inasmuch as each of these two powers has authority over the same subjects, and as it might come to pass that one and the same thing related differently, but still remaining one and the same thing, might belong to the jurisdiction and determination of both, therefore, God, who forsees all things, and who is the Author of these two powers, has marked out the course of each in right correlation to the other. 'For the powers that are, are ordained of God' (Rom. xiii. 1). . . . The State has for its proximate and chief object the well-being of this

mortal life; the Church the everlasting joys of heaven. Whatever, therefore, in things human is of a sacred character, whatever belongs either of its own nature or by reason of the end to which it is referred, to the salvation of souls, or to the worship of God, is subject to the power and judgment of the Church. Whatever is to be ranged under the civil and political order is rightly subject to the civil authority. Jesus Christ has Himself given command that what is Cæsar's is to be rendered to Cæsar, and that which belongs to God. is to be rendered to God" (*The Christian Constitution of States; Cf.* Luke xx. 25).

The Pope's teaching is clear. The State has divine authority as well as the Church; the limits of each are fixed by their special purpose; within these limits each power is supreme; the Church cannot interfere in purely civil matters, nor the State in purely religious matters. The Catholic is bound to obey the State's civil laws, unless they are unjust, destructive of liberty, or contrary to the moral or divine law.

The Catholic Church teaches that no man's allegiance to the State is absolute, but that it is always limited by conscience and the law of God. An unjust law has no validity in morals, nor any binding force in conscience; it must be disobeyed by every Christian, whenever loyalty to Christ demands it. When the Roman Emperors asked the martyrs to sacrifice to the pagan gods; when the Mohammedan required Christians to deny the divinity of Christ; when Elizabeth in England ordered Catholics to deny the supremacy of the Pope in spirituals;—all loyal followers of Christ were compelled in the name of freedom of conscience to refuse compliance, and to defy these tyrants unto death. They said with St. Peter: "We must obey God rather than men" (Acts v. 29). The doctrine of unlimited State sovereignty, advocated by the German Hegel or the English Austin, cannot be held by any Catholic.

A loyal citizen of the United States can be a loyal Catholic, despite the no-Popery bigots of the Marshall and Heflin type, who are remarkable more for their verbosity than for their fairness or their logic. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Catholic loyalty to the Republic has been tested in every war we have fought from the beginning, whether against Protestant England or against Catholic Spain. Our record in the public life of every State is the record of a trust worthily fulfilled, from Charles Carroll of Carrollton down to Governor Smith and Chief Justice White. Washington's words of praise for Catholic loyalty during the Revolution ought never to be forgotten: "I hope ever to see America among the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberality. And I presume that your fellow citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their Revolution and the establishment of

their government, or the important assistance from a nation in which the Roman Catholic faith is professed."

We have been told by some illiterate Ku Kluxers that Catholics cannot be loyal, because the Church's marriage laws are in conflict with the laws of the different States, especially with regard to divorce. An illustrious convert, Dr. Kinsman, one time Protestant bishop of Delaware, thus answers this illogical statement. He writes: "The State allows marriages which the Church forbids, and ignores a standard which the Church believes to be divine. Catholics are bound to obey the Church's laws, and may not avail themselves of the State's permission to contract marriages after divorce. They are not on that account disloyal citizens. There is nothing in their civil obligations to forbid acceptance of the stricter standard. They would like to see the State law more in conformity with this; but no citizen is bound to think State laws perfect, or to refrain from efforts to improve them. Yet a Catholic judge or juryman, acting as citizen, would administer the State law as it stands, no matter how unwilling, as a Catholic, he might be to make any use of the State law's permissions. Nor do Catholics judge by their own standards others, who in good faith live up to standards that are different. Various societies impose upon their members restrictions unknown to the laws of the State, and are guilty of no disobedience in so doing. What is notoriously conceded in the case of others cannot be denied Catholics" (*Americanism and Catholicism,* 152, 153).

CHURCH AND STATE

Did not the Popes, especially in the Syllabus of Pius IX, condemn the American principle of the separation of Church and State? Is it not always better for the two powers to remain separate?

No Pope has condemned the present relation between the Church and State in America, nor has any Pope even expressed a wish that any change should be made. Many non-Catholics cite the Syllabus, without being possessed of the theological training necessary to interpret that document accurately. Cardinal Newman had to teach Mr. Gladstone its meaning in 1874 (*Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*), and Governor Smith of New York had to repeat the lesson, when his loyalty was challenged in 1927 by a bigoted New York lawyer (*Atlantic Monthly,* April, 1927; *Cf.* Conway, *Can a Catholic be President?*).

The Syllabus is merely an index of false doctrines, previously

condemned by Popes Gregory XVI and Pius IX in various Apostolic letters, Briefs and Encyclicals. No one can understand the meaning of its condemned propositions, unless he reads carefully the original context.

The error of amateur theologians, which Cardinal Newman pointed out many years ago (*Difficulties of Anglicans,* ii., 284), "consists of the assumption that the true doctrine on the subject affected by the condemnation is ascertained by formulating the CONTRARY of the proposition condemned. In fact, the correct doctrine is expressed by the CONTRADICTORY proposition. . . . Suppose you assert that every negro is named Johnson. When I denounce this as false, I do not by implication assert that NO negro is named Johnson. All that my denial commits me to is the proposition that NOT ALL negroes bear that cognomen" (Ryan, *Current History,* March, 1928, 782). When, therefore, the Syllabus condemns the proposition (No. 55): *"The Church must be separated from the State, and the State from the Church,"* all that the condemnation implies is that the Church should not ALWAYS be separated from the State. Only the narrow bigot, who believes that the union of Church and State should under no circumstances be maintained, could logically find fault with this reasonable condemnation, or maintain that it involves a conflict of loyalties.

Catholics, while holding firmly the Church's theoretical teaching regarding the ideal State, do not identify this ideal with the actual situation which prevailed throughout the Middle Ages. As Dr. Pohle writes: "The intimate connection of both powers during the Middle Ages was only a passing and temporary phenomenon, arising neither from the essential nature of the State, nor from that of the Church. The Church is free to enter into a more or less close association with the State, but she can also endure actual separation from the State, and, given favorable circumstances, may even prosper under such conditions, as for example in the United States" (*C. E.,* xiv., 769). The liberal formula "a free Church in a free State" has in countries like France and Italy been made the pretext of bitter attacks upon the Church. Although bigotry has often arisen in these United States in organized form, as in the days of Knownothingism, the A.P.A.'s and the Ku Kluxers, the country has never identified itself in any way with their anti-American intolerance. The separation has been honorably maintained.

That is why Cardinal Gibbons, a true Catholic and a loyal American, could write: "American Catholics rejoice in our separation of Church and State; and I can conceive of no combination of circumstances likely to arise, which should make a union desirable either for Church or State. We know the blessings of our present arrangement: it gives us liberty and binds

together priests and people in a union better than that of Church and State. Other countries (Protestant England or Catholic Italy), other manners; we do not believe our system is adapted to all countries; we leave it to Church and State in other lands to solve their problem for their own best interests. For ourselves, we thank God we live in America, "in this happy land of ours," to quote Mr. Roosevelt, "where liberty and religion are natural allies" (*A Retrospect of Fifty Years,* 234).

The disadvantages of the union of Church and State in the past have been fully recognized by Catholic scholars (Pohle, *C. E.,* xiv., 771). But abuses prove the frailty and sins of individual churchmen or politicians; they in no way prove that the system under which they occur is to be condemned.

Bibliography: Allies, *Church and State;* Devas, *The Key to the World's Progress,* iv.; Hergenröther, *Church and State;* D'Hulst, *Conferences de Notre Dame,* v.; Kates, *The Two Swords;* Kinsman *Americanism and Catholicism;* Von Ketteler, *Freiheit, Autorität und Kirche;* Liberatore, *La Chiesa e lo Stato;* Montalembert, *L'Eglise libre dans l'Etat Libre;* Parsons, *Church and State;* Pesch, *Christl. Staatslehre;* Rickaby, *Moral Philosophy;* Ryan, *The Church and the Citizen;* Ryan-Miller, *The State and the Church.* A. Q. 1877, 430; 1891, 20; 1897, 98.—C. W. v. 1; xi. 145; xxii. 31; liv. 389; cxxvii. 319.—D. July, 1878.—R. C. iv. 553; xii. 275.

THE CHARGE OF PERSECUTION

Does your Church approve of bringing people into her fold by force, as happened in the days of Charlemagne, of Louis XIV, and the Kings of Spain with regard to the Jews and Moors?

No, the Church is in no way responsible for the actions of Catholic sovereigns, who from motives of policy, avarice or mistaken zeal used force in bringing about conversions. Alcuin and Arno of Salsburg severely blamed Charlemagne for his enforced conversion of the pagan Saxons; Pope Innocent XI rebuked Louis XIV for his cruel dragonnades, and asked James II to interpose his good offices on behalf of the oppressed French Huguenots; Sixtus IV continually denounced the arbitrary cruelty and injustice of the Spanish Inquisition (Alzog, *Church History,* ii., 122; iii., 284; Pastor, *History of the Popes,* iv., 399-402).

The teaching of the Church on this matter is plainly set forth in the writings of Tertullian, Origen, St. Cyprian, Lactantius, St. Hilary and others. Tertullian writes: "It is a fundamental human right, a privilege of nature, that every man should worship according to his convictions. It is assuredly no part of

religion to compel religion. It must be embraced freely and not forced" (*Ad Scapulam,* ii., ch. ii.). Origen writes: "It is impossible to harmonize the legislation of Moses with the calling of the Gentiles. . . . For Christians cannot slay their enemies, or condemn, as Moses commanded, the contemners of the law to be put to death by burning or stoning" (*Contra Celsum,* vii., 26). St. Cyprian writes :"Now that circumcision has begun to be of the spirit among God's faithful servants, the proud and contumacious are slain with the sword of the spirit by being cast out of the Church" (*Epis.* 82, *Ad Pomponium*). Lactantius writes: "There is no justification for violence and injury, for religion cannot be imposed by force. It is a matter of the will, which must be influenced by words, not by blows. . . . Religion is to be defended, not by putting to death, but by dying; not by cruelty, but by patient endurance; not by crime, but by faith. . . . If you wish to defend religion by bloodshed, by tortures and by crime, you no longer defend it, but pollute and profane it. For nothing is so much a matter of free will as religion" (*Divin. Instit.,* v., 20).

St. Hilary of Poitiers, exiled for four years by the Arian Emperor Constantius, writes: "To-day while the power of the State enforces divine faith, men say that Christ is powerless. The Church threatens exile and imprisonment; she in whom men formerly believed while in exile and prison, now wishes to make men believe her by force" (*Contra Auxentium,* iv.).

Bibliography: Vacandard, *The Inquisition,* i.

THE INQUISITION

Are not Catholics bound to defend the Inquisition with all its cruelty and injustice as an essential part of the Church's constitution? Were its rulings infallible? Would not Catholics be urged to-day to set it working again by the Pope, if he had the power to enforce its laws?

"Catholics," writes Father Keating, "are by no means concerned to defend this tribunal in all the details of its activity. It manifested all the characteristics of administration of justice in those rude times, though generally in a milder form. That its processes, according to modern notions, were faulty; that, just like the secular courts of law, it often suffered from the abuses to which its procedure laid it open; that it was used to satisfy avarice and glut private enmities; that its officials were not always above suspicion in their motives; that its penalties

were often arbitrary, unjust, cruel—these may be established facts; but the inference is not that the institution was unwarranted by the circumstances of the age or opposed to its mentality. The attachment of physical penalties to offences largely spiritual, the use of torture to elicit evidence, the defects of the legal methods, the harshness of the sentences, these characterized the tribunal, not because it was Catholic, but because it was medieval. . . . There is nothing in the history of the Inquisition which invalidates the claim of the Church to be the Church of Christ. All that Christ guaranteed her in her institution was that, through His divine power, she should never cease to exist, should always be guided in her teaching by His Spirit, and should never, therefore, lead His flock astray into false pastures. For the rest the Church is composed of human beings, and, therefore, outside the limits implied in these divine promises, is exposed to human frailties. History shows that she has not been protected against mistakes in policy and errors in administration" (*Does the Catholic Church Persecute?*, 21, 22).

Blotzer writes in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*: "It is essential to note that the Inquisition, in its establishment and procedure, pertains not to the sphere of belief, but to that of discipline. The dogmatic teaching of the Church is in no way affected by the question whether the Inquisition was justified in its scope, wise in its methods, or extreme in its practice" (viii., 36).

Vacandard says: "Even if to-day the Church were to denounce the Inquisition, she would not thereby compromise her divine authority. Her office on earth is to transmit to generation after generation the deposit of revealed truths necessary for man's salvation. That to safeguard this treasure she uses means in one age which a later age denounces, merely proves that she follows the customs and ideas in vogue around her. But she takes good care not to have men consider her attitude the infallible and eternal rule of absolute justice. She readily admits that she sometimes may be deceived in the choice of means of government" (*The Inquisition*, 255).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Lilly, *Christianity and Modern Civilization*, 297-334; Tanon, *Histoire des Tribunaux de l'Inquisition*. A. Q. 1876, 254; 1887, 691; 1888, 385.—D. T. vii. 2015-2067.

A fairminded man ought not to view the twelfth or the thirteenth century from the standpoint of the twentieth. In the Middle Ages the people regarded heresy with the same horror that Southerners to-day regard crimes against women. The mob at Soissons, Orleans, and Cologne in the eleventh century burned the heretic at the stake, just as the mob in Tennessee and Alabama burns the negro for rape in the twentieth. Even the anti-Catholic Lea admits this. He writes: "The practice of burning the heretic was not the creation of positive law, but

arose generally and spontaneously, and its adoption by the legislator was only the recognition of a popular custom" (*A History of the Inquisition,* i., 222).

The very fact that the Church could call upon the civil power to repress rebellion against her teaching, proves conclusively that the men of that day considered the Church's teaching necessary for the well-being of society. Many non-Catholics to-day find this viewpoint difficult to understand, for with them religion is a matter of human opinion. They believe that a man is free to choose his religious beliefs, as he chooses the style of his coat, or his political opinions. They have ceased to regard religious truth as something objective; they have ceased to believe in a divine revelation.

We must remember also that heresy in the Middle Ages was very often allied with some anti-social sect, which, like modern anarchism and Bolshevism, menaced the very existence of the State. The Cathari of the thirteenth century not only denied the authority of the Church, the supremacy of the Pope, and the divine institution of the Sacraments, but they rejected the oath of fealty, condemned marriage as immoral, and advocated suicide as the highest duty of "the perfect."

Their absolute rejection of the oath of fealty was calculated to break the bond that united subjects to their feudal lords; their views on taxation, war, and allegiance were unpatriotic in the extreme; their anti-social views on marriage and suicide would, if carried out, have meant the destruction of the human race (Vacandard, *The Inquisition,* 68-104). By the very nature of things, therefore, the interests of both Church and State were identical. If we were to deduct the anarchists and the criminals from the total number burned or imprisoned, the number of condemned "heretics" would be greatly reduced.

Non-Catholics who believe that the Church would revive the Inquisition to-day if she had the power, forget that the majority of modern theologians, while admitting the Church has a coercive power in both the external and internal forum, limit it to merely moral restraint. So Vacandard (*The Inquisition,* 250), Vermeersch (*Tolerance,* 74), Cardinal Soglia (*Instit. Juris Pub. Eccles.,* i., 170), and Keating (*Does the Church Persecute?,* 28). Keating writes: "Were the Church in absolute power to-day she would seek to repress by force none of the liberties which have grown with the growth of the civilization she inspired, and are dear to this age. There is nothing in her spirit to show that she would go beyond the well-ordered civil State in checking such license as would dissolve society. She is a voluntary association; her members are won to her by the evidence of truth and the power of grace, and they are held by the same means" (*Ibid.,* 31)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Alzog, *Church History,* ii., 979; Cantu, *Les Héretiques d'Italie;* Douais, *l'Inquisition; Ses Origines, Sa. Procedure; Documents pour servir l'Histoire de l'Inquisition;* Eymeric, *Directorium Inquisitionis;* Gui, *Pracitica Inquisitionis;* Guiraud, *Questions d'Histoire et d'Archaéologie Chrêtienne,* 8-149; *Histoire Partiale: Histoire Vraie,* I., 291; Langlois, *l'Inquisition d'après les Travaux Récents;* Mourret, *Histoire de l'Eglise,* iv., 427; Maycock, *The Inquisition;* Rodrigo, *Historia Verdadera de la Inquisicion;* Tocco, *l'Eresia nel Medio Evo;* Vacandard, *The Inquisition;* Vermeersch, *Tolerance.* C. E. viii. 26-38.—D. A. ii. 823-890.—R. A. July 15, 1906.—R. C. 1905-1906.

Must we not thank the Reformation for the fact that men to-day are no longer tortured, imprisoned and put to death for heresy?

By no means. The leading Reformers both in England and on the Continent taught without question the medieval doctrine of intolerance.

Harnack says of Luther: "It is an altogether one-sided view, one, indeed, which willfully disregards the facts, to hail in Luther the man of the new age, the hero of enlightenment and the creator of the modern spirit" (*Lehrbuch der Dogmengsch,* iii., 810). Catholics and Zwinglians in Saxony who did not conform to the Lutheran doctrine were to be exiled, and the Anabaptists, even though they did not openly teach seditious doctrines, were to be put to death (Grisar, *Luther,* v., 592; vi., 252). Melanchthon in a letter to Calvin in 1554 approved the burning of Servetus, saying: "I agree entirely with your sentence; I also declare that your authorities have acted wisely and justly in putting this blasphemous man to death" (Grisar, *ibid.,* iii., 358). Calvin burned Servetus for denying the Trinity, and wrote a treatise to defend his action. Farel wrote to Calvin in 1533: "Some people do not wish us to prosecute heretics. But because the Pope condemns the faithful (the Huguenots) for the crime of heresy, it is absurd to conclude that we must not put heretics to death, in order to strengthen the faithful." Theodore of Beza wrote in 1554: "What crime can be greater or more heinous than heresy, which sets at naught the word of God and all ecclesiastical discipline? Christian magistrates, do your duty to God, who has put the sword into your hands for the honor of His majesty; strike valiantly these monsters in the guise of men" (Vacandard, *The Inquisition,* 222-224).

The history of the penal laws of Great Britain and Ireland under Henry VIII, Elizabeth, Edward VI, James I, Charles I, Cromwell, Charles II and William III is a history of fines, imprisonment, banishment, torture and death for the practice of the

Catholic faith (D'Alton, *The History of Ireland,* xi.; Amherst, *Catholic Emancipation;* Birt, *The Elizabethan Settlement;* Gasquet, *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries;* Gerard, *Catholics Under James I;* Lingard, *History of England,* v., vi., vii.; Moran, *The Persecution of Irish Catholics;* Murphy, *Cromwell in Ireland;* O'Connor, *Elizabethan Ireland. D.,* April, 1929).

Lecky, after stating that Catholicism was "an ancient church, resting avowedly on the principle of authority, and defending herself against aggression and innovation," adds: "But what shall we say of a church that was but a thing of yesterday, a church that had as yet no services to show, no claims upon the gratitude of mankind, a church that was by profession a creature of private judgment, and was in reality generated by the intrigues of a corrupt court, which, nevertheless, suppressed by force a worship that multitudes deemed necessary for their salvation, and by all her organs, and with all her energies, persecuted those who clung to the religion of their fathers?" (*History of Rationalism in Europe,* ii., 19.)

Hallam bears similar testimony. He writes: "Persecution for religious heterodoxy in all its degrees was in the sixteenth century the principle as well as the practice of every church. It was held inconsistent with the sovereignty of the magistrate to permit any religion but his own, inconsistent with his duty to suffer any but the true. . . . Persecution is the deadly original sin of the reformed churches, which cools every honest man's zeal for their cause, in proportion as his reading becomes more extensive" (*Literature of Europe,* ii., ch. ii.; *Constitutional History,* i., ch. ii.).

Lord Acton, an enemy of intolerance if ever there was one, while admitting the intolerance of both Catholics and non-Catholics in the past thus contrasts them: "Protestantism set up intolerance as an imperative precept and as a part of its doctrine, and it was forced to admit toleration by the necessities of its position. . . . The Catholic Church began with the principle of liberty, both as her claim and as her rule, and external circumstances forced intolerance upon her" (*The History of Freedom,* 187).

THE CRUSADE AGAINST THE ALBIGENSES

Do you dare defend the cruelty of Pope Innocent III (1198-1216), in ordering the crusade against the Albigenses, and in mercilessly demanding that they be put to death?

Yes we do defend his policy, for the laws he enacted were not at all excessive compared with the strict Roman law, or

even with the practice then in vogue in France and Germany (Vacandard, *The Inquisition,* 46). Havet writes: "We must in justice say of Innocent III that, if he did bitterly prosecute heretics, and everywhere put them under the ban, he never demanded the infliction of the death penalty" (*l'Héresie et le Bras Séculier,* 165). Luchaire also shows that the laws and letters of Innocent III speak of banishment and confiscation of the property of the Albigenses, but *they never once mention the death penalty* (*La Croisade des Albigeois,* 57).

The Albigenses of Southern France in the thirteenth century were a disturbing element in the Christian commonwealth, like the Russian Bolshevists of to-day, who endeavor to stir up trouble everywhere for legitimate governments. They were an anti-Christian and an anti-social body, which denied marriage, questioned the lawfulness of oaths, refused feudal service on the plea that all war was unlawful, and rejected every teaching of the universal Church in the name of a pagan, Manichean dualism (Vacandard, *The Inquisition,* ch. v.). Their chief defender was Raymond VI, Count of Toulouse (1194-1222), who had for years oppressed the Church in his domains, expelling bishops from their sees, despoiling the monasteries, and devastating the country with his mercenaries.

This anti-Christian heresy had been growing stronger and stronger for well nigh one hundred years, despite the condemnation of the Councils of Arras, Charreux, Vienne, Reims and the Third Lateran, and the condemnation of Popes Eugenius III (1145-1153) and Alexander III (1159-1181). The preaching of many a Papal legate—Cardinal Alberic, St. Bernard, the Bishop of Osma, and St. Dominic—had proved of no avail. The murder of Innocent's legate, Peter of Castelnau, brought matters to a crisis in 1208. The Pope, seeing that peaceful methods had failed, called upon the King of France, the suzerain of Toulouse, to use force, and the crusade began under the leadership of Simon de Montfort.

After three years of continual fighting, the religious crusade degenerated into a war conquest. But although de Montfort won a decisive victory at Muret over Pedro of Aragon and Count Raymond, he fell in battle soon afterwards, and the fruits of his conquest were gathered in by the King of France.

No Catholic defends the injustice of some of the inquisitors or the cruelties of the soldiers of de Montfort, but Frenchmen rightly see in this religious war the definite establishing of the French monarchy (Boutaric, *St. Louis et Alphonse de Poitiers,* 15), and even rationalists like Sabatier consider the triumph of the Papacy "a triumph of good sense and reason" (Sabatier, *Vie de St. François,* 40). Dr. Mann, in his *Lives of the Popes,* says: "It is assuredly a pity that the salvation of Christen-

dom should have cost so much blood. But many more lives have often been sacrificed for ends much less valuable than those for which Innocent invoked the swords of the Christians of the North. Innocent was striving to maintain the principles upon which rested not merely the human society of the day in which he lived himself, but the principles upon which rest all healthy society till the end of the world. . . . The action of Innocent in the matter of the Albigenses was approved by perhaps the greatest international assembly that Europe has ever seen—the Lateran Council of 1215. No voice was raised against the action of Innocent in his own age" (xii., p. 260).

Bibliography: Douais, *Les Albigeois: Leurs Origines;* Guiraud, *Questions d'Histoire,* 3-149; Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles,* v., 1260-1313, 1329, 1333; Innocent III, *Epistolæ P. L.,* 214-217; Schmidt, *Histoire des Cathares;* Tocco, *l'Eresia nel Medio Evo.*

Is it not true that at the siege of Béziers (1209) the Papal legate, Arnaud de Citeaux, said to the Crusaders before the massacre: "Kill them all; God will recognize His own?"

No, this is one of the many historical legends rejected to-day by all critical scholars, just as they stigmatize as false Galileo's words *E pur se muove,* and Luther's words at the Diet of Worms: "Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise" (*Cf.* Grisar, *Luther,* ii., 75, 76, who quotes Protestant historians, such as Müller, Kalkoff, and Friedensburg).

These legendary words of the Papal legate are not mentioned by any contemporary writer, who treats of the Albigensian crusade, *viz.,* Peter de Vaulx-Cernay, William de Puylaurens, Alberic des Trois-Fontaines, William le Breton or William de Nangis. This fable contradicts the facts of the case, and the well-known character of the legate, portrayed for us by de Vaulx-Cernay, who accompanied the expedition. The massacre was not a premeditated affair, but a sudden act of fury occasioned by the obstinacy of the besieged.

The words are taken from the gossipy and unreliable *Dialogus Magnus Visionum atque Miraculorum* of Peter Cæsarius of Heisterbach, a book lately translated by Scott and Bland (Routledge, 2 vols.). This German Cistercian wrote his work sixty years after the siege, and takes good care to warn his readers that he is merely recording a rumor; *dixisse fertur* are his words of introduction.

Bibliography: Guiraud, *Histoire Partiale: Histoire Vraie,* i., 287. Tamisey de Laroque in A. N. vi. 115-128.—D. A. l. 79.

THE SPANISH INQUISITION

Was not the Spanish Inquisition one of the most cruel institutions the world has ever known? Was not the authority of the Popes used to urge Catholic Spain to repress and punish heresy?

Inhumanity is not a special prerogative of Catholic Spain; it was characteristic of the cruel Inquisition of Lutheran Saxony, the Genevan Inquisition of Calvinistic Switzerland, and the English Inquisition of Elizabeth, James I and Cromwell.

On November 1, 1478, Pope Sixtus IV empowered Ferdinand and Isabella to establish the Inquisition in Spain. In the beginning it was directed primarily against the many pseudo-Jewish converts (*Maranos*), who after popular uprisings against their usury and extortion, had accepted Baptism merely as the alternative to death. As Hefele says: "They threatened alike the Spanish nationality and the Christian faith. On the one hand they contrived to insinuate themselves into a number of ecclesiastical charges, and even to become bishops, and on the other hand to obtain high municipal honors, and to marry into all the noble families. These advantages, and their great wealth, were all covertly devoted to the gradual subjugation of the Spaniards, and the undermining of their faith in favor of Jews and Judaism" (*Ximines*, 277).

The successful Spanish war against the Moors (1480-1492) also resulted in a great number of nominal conversions for the sake of temporal advantage. These pseudo Moorish Converts (*Moriscos*), added another factor to the problem of national disunion, which the Spanish monarchs determined to fight, as the French kings fought the Huguenot separatists a century later, or Lincoln fought our Southern separatists in 1861. Later on under Philip II (1556-1598), the Inquisition was the weapon used successively to prevent Protestantism from dividing the kingdom.

It is beyond question that the Spanish monarchs often made the real danger that existed from these pretended Jewish and Moorish converts a mere pretext for prosecuting any powerful enemy of the crown, and for filling the treasury's empty coffers by the arbitrary confiscation of the property of innocent citizens. That the inquisitors sometimes played into their hands, we learn from a brief of Sixtus IV, January 29, 1482, which mentions a number of Spaniards imprisoned without trial, subjected to cruel tortures, and unjustly deprived of their possessions by inquisitors who disregarded all law and justice (Pastor, *History of the Popes*, iv 400). Drastic laws always beget a set of unscrupulous politicians who rob and murder, as we have learned of late in these

United States from the lawless actions of too many of our prohibition enforcement agents.

The old view that the Inquisition was purely a State institution was popularized in France by De Maistre (*Lettre à un Gentilhomme Russe*), Gams (*Zur Gesch. der Span. Staatsinquisition*), Hergenröther (*The Church and State*) and by the Protestant historian von Ranke (*Fürsten und Völker*), but the majority of Catholic scholars to-day hold with Pastor that "it was a mixed, but primarily an ecclesiastical institution" (*History of the Popes,* iv., 402; *Cf.* Balmes, Prat, Orti y Lara, Grisar, Bauer, Kraus, Funk, Brück, and Marin). The Pope established it, gave the Grand Inquisitor the necessary jurisdiction, and empowered the Council to act only through his delegate. The fact that the condemned were always handed over to the secular arm proves the correctness of this theory.

Catholics, while sympathizing with the Spanish kings in their desire for political unity, and with their hatred of heresy, are just as vehement as non-Catholics in their denunciation of the cruelties and the injustice of the Spanish Inquisition. They, however, ask fairminded men not to judge the fifteenth century from the viewpoint of the twentieth. The Church's office is to transmit to the ages the deposit of faith she has received from her divine founder. "That to safeguard this treasure she uses means in one age which a later age denounces merely proves that she follows the customs and ideas in vogue around her. But she takes good care not to have men consider her attitude the infallible rule of absolute justice" (Vacandard, *The Inquisition,* 187).

The words of Cardinal Gibbons are indorsed by every Catholic. He wrote in his *Faith of Our Fathers:* "I heartily pray that religious intolerance may never take root in our favored land. May the only king to force our conscience be the King of Kings; may the only prison erected among us for the sin of unbelief or misbelief be the prison of a troubled conscience; and may our only motive for embracing truth be not the fear of men, but the love of truth and of God" (259).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Balmes, *European Civilization,* 203-219; Smith, *The Spanish Inquisition.* C. E. viii. 36.

THE MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY

Did not Charles IX of France and his mother Catherine de Médicis, under orders from the Pope, slaughter one hundred thousand Huguenots on St. Bartholomew's Day, August 24, 1572?

Did not Pope Pius V plot this crime with the French Court, and did not Pope Gregory XIII sing a *Te Deum* for it in Rome?

The Popes had nothing to do with the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day. Pius V did not plan the massacre with Catherine de Médicis, nor did he ever urge it upon the French court in any way; Gregory XIII never approved of the crime, but had a *Te Deum* sung in thanksgiving for the saving of the King and the royal family from death, according to advices sent him from the French court. The Pope's congratulations were on a par with the congratulations sent in modern times by one State to another, when informed that a King or a President has escaped an assassin's bullet or bomb.

The massacre was a dastardly political crime of Catherine de Médicis, planned the evening before to avert the possible consequences of her attempted assassination of Coligny on August 22.

Catherine had as much zeal for the Catholic religion as a modern bootlegger has for the cause of prohibition. She was a freethinker of the school of Machiavelli, bred in the worst traditions of the Italian tyrants, and ruling one of the most corrupt courts of Christendom. Her one aim in life was to govern France personally or through her puppet sons, and to strengthen her power by placing her children on the thrones of England, Spain and Poland. Jealous alike of both the Catholic and the Huguenot princes, she played one against the other to gain her ends. When Coligny began to overshadow her, and to undermine her influence with her son Charles, she deliberately planned his death.

No one holds to-day that the massacre was premeditated. In fact it was planned and executed so quickly that the French court did not at first know what defence to manufacture for the other nations of Europe. On the very day it occurred Charles wrote his ambassador in England that it was due to a faction fight between the Duke of Guise and the friends of Coligny, whom he blamed for having murdered his father. When the Duke of Guise refused to accept the full infamy of the crime, the King wrote the following day that he himself assumed responsibility for all that had happened. He declared that he had ordered the massacre to frustrate a conspiracy of Coligny and his followers to kill himself and all the royal family. With the exception of Germany and Switzerland, this diplomatic lie was accepted by all Europe, and congratulatory messages were received by Charles IX from the Venetian Senate, the Duke of Tuscany, Philip II of Spain and Elizabeth of England.

It is true that Pius V frequently urged the French court to take the severest measures against the Huguenots, whom he

rightly regarded as enemies of both Church and State. He wrote to Charles and Catherine "to fight the enemies of the Church openly and freely to their utter destruction," and "to grant no toleration to these rebels, lest the Kingdom of France be the bloody scene of continual sedition." We are not called upon to defend the Pope's political views for the safeguarding of the French monarchy, although it is certain that a strong consistent policy would have saved France a great deal of turmoil and bloodshed. The Pope wished the war fought to a finish, and the rebels utterly subdued. He was indignant when he heard of royal victories ending in the profit of the vanquished. Open warfare, however, is one thing; assassination another.

Not a bishop of France was present at the meeting that planned the massacre; no bishop ever gave it his approval. The Cardinal of Lorraine, who is often pictured blessing the daggers of the murderers of Paris, was actually in Rome when the massacre occurred. As the latest Protestant historian of Catherine says: "Upon Catherine de Médicis the chief responsibility for the deed must always rest." And he adds: "No one who knows anything of her character through her letters, or who had carefully studied her tortuous state policy, could suspect for one moment that there was in her anything resembling religious fanaticism" (Van Dyck, *Catherine de Médicis,* ii., 88).

How many were killed in France during the six weeks of the massacre will never be accurately known. The estimates of over a score of contemporary and modern historians range all the way from 2,000 to 110,000, which proves that the figures given are mere guess work, like the figures of modern scientists estimating the age of the world. Lord Acton and Van Dyck believe that between three or four thousand perished in Paris, and perhaps as many more in the provinces. An ancient account book of the Hotel de Ville of Paris, cited by the Abbé de Caveirac in his *Apology of Louis XIV* mentions the burial of 1,100 victims in the Cemetery of the Innocents, while the *Huguenot Martyrology,* published in 1581, could only obtain the names of 786.

That France lied to the Pope about the facts in the case, describing the massacre as the just punishment of conspirators, we know from the reports of the King's messenger, De Beauvillier, and from the letters of the French ambassador de Férals, the Cardinal de Bourbon, and the Papal nuncio. Brantôme, in his Memoirs, says that when the Pope learned the real facts, he shed bitter tears, and denounced the massacre "as unlawful and forbidden by God."

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Acton, *La Strage di San Bartololmeo;* Conway, *The Massacre of St. Bariholomew's Day;* La Ferrière, *La S. Barthélemy;* Guiraud, *Histoire Partiale: Histoire Vraie,* ii., 374; Lingard, *History of England,* vii., 320; viii., 97; Vacandard, *Etudes de*

Critique; Van Dyck, *Catherine de Médicis,* ii., 77-117. C. C. viii. 679; ix. 267, 662; x. 268; xi. 14, 662.—D. Oct., 1865; April, 1924.—D. A. i. 420.

THE REVOCATION OF THE EDICT OF NANTES

Did not Pope Innocent XI urge Louis XIV to revoke the Edict of Nantes (October, 1685), and to persecute the French Huguenots?

Innocent XI did nothing whatever to bring about the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. As a matter of fact he asked his Nuncio in England to have James II intercede with Louis XIV in favor of the persecuted Huguenots (Gerin in *R. Q.,* xxiv., 440). The Protestant historian, Ranke, in his *History of the Popes* (ii., 306), admits this. He writes: "It has been alleged that Pope Innocent XI was privy to and an abettor of the design; but in reality this was not the case. The Roman court would have nothing to do with a conversion affected by armed Apostles. Christ has not employed such means; men should be led, but not dragged into the Church."

By the Edict of Nantes (April, 1598) Henry IV had granted toleration to the French Huguenots, hoping thereby to put an end to the long series of religious wars which had devastated France. The Edict accorded the Huguenots the liberty of private and public worship in two hundred towns and some three thousand seigneural domains. It endowed the Huguenot schools, permitted their churches to receive gifts and legacies, granted the right of holding synods and many other privileges. From a political standpoint it made the vital mistake of giving the Huguenots complete control of two hundred towns, including the important cautionary towns of La Rochelle, Montauban and Montpelier.

If we remember that the Huguenots formed less than one-fifteenth of the population of France, it is certainly a remarkable fact that this Edict of toleration was observed for nearly one hundred years. During this same period no Catholic in England or in the Scandinavian countries could openly practice his religion, and no government in the twentieth century would dream of allowing such absolute political independence to any religious sect. I have never read of any non-Catholic historian praising Louis XII, or Cardinals Richelieu or Mazarin for their reaffirming of this Edict in 1629 and 1652. Richelieu, it is true, put an end to the political power of the Huguenot State within a State when he brought about the fall of La Rochelle in 1628, but the Huguenots had plainly violated the Edict by refusing to tolerate

the practice of Catholicism, and had formed a treasonable alliance with France's hereditary enemy, England.

From the very first days of his reign Louis XIV gave evidence that he regarded the very existence of the Huguenots—a party aloof from the national unity—as an open affront to his despotic sovereignty. If religion entered his mind at all, it was merely from a desire to atone for his many conflicts with the Pope, by manifesting his zeal for the faith. As his latest biographer says: "He judged religious questions from a purely political point of view—as King of France, not as a theologian. . . . If he considered Protestants enemies of the State, it was because, under the cover of religion, they were sowing dissension throughout the nation, and weakening it in the face of the enemy" (Bertrand, *Louis XIV,* 346). The Huguenots of his time were an unarmed and peaceful body, whose conversion, he wrongly thought, could be easily brought about. Their refusal to conform simply angered this despot, and led him to undertake an unchristian policy of suppression, as in England the tyranny of an Elizabeth or a James I enacted the death penalty against Catholics. What his despotic grandfather had decreed, he could just as despotically revoke. The subservient Parliament of the day had merely to register his Edict, and his officers had merely to enforce it.

Catholics are not called upon to defend the political policy of Louis XIV any more than they are bound to apologize for his impudent Gallicanism, his gross extravagance, his ruthless wars, or his flagrant immorality. In fact he was simply acting on the Protestant principle set forth by the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, which the Popes had denounced: "Cujus regio, illius est religion: the kingdom must follow the religion of the prince."

The revocation of the Edict of Nantes was a grave political mistake, for it drove from France about 200,000 of its citizens, cost France some twelve millions of dollars, injured her commerce and her industries, and furnished many a recruit to the armies and navies of her enemies. It was, moreover, carried out in violation of a fundamental human right, for as Tertullian says: "It is assuredly no part of religion to compel religion. It must be embraced freely, and not forced" (*Liber ad Scapulam,* ch. ii.). The excessive cruelty of the conversions enforced by the dragonnades was denounced by many of the French Bishops of the time, who had given their approval to the revocation of the Edict itself; *viz.,* Bossuet of Meaux, Fenélon of Cambrai, de Noailles of Paris, Le Tellier of Montpelier, and Le Camus of Grenoble.

Bibliography: Giraud, *Histoire Partiale: Histoire Vraie,* iii., 1-131; Mourret, *Histoire de l'Eglise,* vi., 289-300; Wilkinson, *The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.* R. C. xii. 84.

MARY TUDOR

Did not the cruel and bigoted Catholic Queen, Mary Tudor (1553-1558), put thousands of Protestants to death at the stake, thus meriting the title of "Bloody Mary"?

The title of "Bloody" might just as well have been given to Henry VIII, Elizabeth or Cromwell, had Catholicism and not Protestantism dominated English literature for the past four centuries.

The portrait of Mary Tudor as a cruel and bigoted tyrant, first sketched by the lying Foxe in his *Book of Martyrs,* and slavishly copied by many an anti-Catholic English historian (Hume, *History of England,* iv., 404), has within the past fifty years been stigmatized as a caricature by Catholic and non-Catholic students of the Tudor period, *viz.,* Gairdner, Innes, Pastor, Pollard, Stone, Zimmermann and others. Innes says of her: "From the time of her childhood she was exposed to unceasing hardness; a princess born, she was treated as bastard; despite all, her natural generosity survived. Royally courageous, loyal and straightforward; to her personal enemies almost magnanimous; to the poor, and afflicted, pitiful; loving her country passionately. She was blind to the forces at work in the world, obsessed with the idea of one supreme duty, and she set herself, as she deemed, to battle with Antichrist by the only methods she knew, though they were alien to her natural disposition, facing hatred and obloquy" (*England Under the Tudors,* 242).

But while her personal life was chaste and pious, all admit that as a political ruler of a powerful kingdom she was utterly incompetent and inefficient. Her Spanish blood prompted her to lean upon the Emperor, Charles V, and to marry Philip II, his son, an unwise and foolish policy that angered her people, led to the war with France, and antagonized Pope Paul IV, who, towards the end of her reign, excommunicated Philip II. In her conscientious desire to restore the stolen church lands, she failed to realize how much the wealthy English nobles dreaded the possible consequences of a reconciliation with the Papacy, although Rome was far-sighted enough to point out her mistake. Her worst error was her failure to understand the England of her day, which had become religiously indifferent owing to the anti-Catholic reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI. Her misguided zeal, "for the peace of the Church," as Father Thurston calls it (*C. E.,* ix., 767), made her compel Parliament—no Tudor Parliament was free—to reenact the heresy laws of Richard II, Henry IV and Henry V (December, 1554), which in four years sent not thousands but two hundred Protestants to the stake. It

is true that under Henry VIII and Edward VI men had been burned for their religious opinions, and that three of the most prominent Protestant bishops she condemned had fully consented to their burning (*Cambridge Modern History,* ii., 538; *Grey Friar's Chronicle,* 194). "The fundamental fact, which must not be forgotten in judging the authors of the persecution, is that the general horror of death as the penalty of a false opinion was not antecedent but consequent upon it. What they did was on an unprecedented scale, because heresy existed on an unprecedented scale" (Innes, *ibid.,* 232).

Ridley, Latimer and Cranmer ought to have been executed for treason, for they had all shared in Northumberland's plot to dethrone Mary (Lingard, *History of England,* v., 359, 472-474). When, against the advice of the lawyers of the crown, the dying boy King Edward VI, at Northumberland's urging, illegally set aside his father's will, and transferred the succession to Lady Jane Grey, Cranmer signed the document. Even so ultra a Protestant apologist as Deane (*Thomas Cranmer,* 214-217) characterizes Cranmer as "a coward, a perjurer and a traitor." Mary, who hated heresy more than she hated treason, had Cranmer executed as a heretic—a mistake that the cleverer Elizabeth would not have made. She and her master, Cecil, put priests to death for saying Mass, but to save their face they hypocritically called it "treason."

From the very beginning Mary Tudor had to fight for her life. The rebels under Northumberland, who attempted to place Lady Jane Grey upon the throne, were treated most leniently (Innes, *ibid.,* 219). Her mildness was mistaken for weakness, as Wyatt's rebellion the year afterwards proved (*Cambridge Modern History,* ii., 538). Considering her peril, the punishment she meted out to the rebels in this second uprising was severe, but it was certainly justified. Like most men or women of lowly origin who become possessed of limitless power, the Tudors were all despots. Mary was determined to restore the old religion of her mother, just as Elizabeth was determined to extirpate it. She was undoubtedly angered at the many scurrilous and seditious writings published against her government by the fanatical Protestants in England and on the continent, and she was naturally indignant at the many outrages committed daily against the Catholic faith (Pastor, *History of the Popes,* xiv., 361). "If," as Gairdner says, "the old religion was to be restored, it had to be protected from insult and violence, which were only too prevalent, and the renewal of the former laws against heresy seemed the only effectual means of doing so" (*English Historical Review,* xxi., 373).

The reckless charges made against Bishop Bonner of London by Foxe and Bale, and repeated by Burnet and Hume, have been

refuted by Protestant historical scholars like Maitland (*Essays on the Reformation,* 409) and Bass-Mullinger in the *Cambridge Modern History* (ii., 533). Like justice has been rendered to Cardinal Pole (*Ibid.,* 543).

Bibliography: Gairdner, *History of the English Church in the Sixteenth Century; Lollardy* (2 vols.); Haile, *Cardinal Pole;* Kennedy, *Studies in Tudor History,* 117-142; Lingard, *History of England,* v., 368-536; Pastor, *History of the Popes,* xiii., 244-289; xiv., 360-400; Pontifex, *The Fires of Smithfield;* Stone, *Mary of England;* Zimmermann, *Marie die Katholische.* C. E. ix. 766.—C. W. xii. 18.—D. Oct., 1889; July, 1890; April, 1890; July, 1895.—M. xciv. 128.

EXCOMMUNICATION AND ANATHEMA

Does not your practice of excommunicating and anathematizing people imply condemning them to eternal perdition? Were not the medieval bishops too prone to use this weapon against their enemies?

Neither excommunication nor anathemas imply the Church's condemning anyone to hell. That is the prerogative of God alone. Excommunication is a Church law, excluding a notorious sinner from the communion of the faithful (Canons 2257-2267). Its purpose is to warn the sinner of the danger he runs of incurring eternal ruin, unless he repent of his sin. The "delivering of the sinner to Satan," which we find in the Roman Pontifical, is based on the words of St. Paul, who delivered the incestuous sinner to Satan, "that his spirit might be saved in the Day of the Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. v. 5; *Cf.* 1 Tim. i. 20).

It is true that excommunication was enacted too frequently, and in some cases without just cause, for the Council of Trent, aware of these abuses, solemnly warned the bishops to be more moderate in its use. It declares: "Although the sword of excommunication is the very sinews of ecclesiastical discipline . . . yet it is to be used with sobriety and great circumspection; seeing that experience teaches that if it be wielded rashly and for slight causes, it is more despised than feared, and works more evil than good" (Sess. xxv., ch. iii., *De Ref.*).

When St. Paul said "let him be anathema" who preaches an heretical gospel (Gal. i. 8), he did not condemn the heretic to hell, but stigmatized the willful teacher of false doctrines as a rebel against the Gospel of Christ. The Church, in the anathemas which accompany the canons of her Councils, merely imitates the example of the Apostle.

Bibliography: Thurston. *Excommunication.* A. Q. 1887, 603-663.—C. E. v. 678-691; i. 455-457.—D. T. i. 1168.—R. C. vii. 166-271, 360.

THE ROMAN INDEX

Is not the Roman Index a clear proof of clerical intolerance? Should not Catholics be allowed to read both sides of a disputed question? Ought people of mature years to be treated as children? Has not the Church often made mistakes in condemning books, like the works of Copernicus and Galileo, Dante's *Divina Commedia*, and even the Psalms of David?

The Roman Index proves, not the Church's intolerance, but her zeal for the salvation of souls. As Christ's representative, she is bound to safeguard by every means in her power the faith and morals of her chlidren. Experience has taught her that many make shipwreck of their faith, and give themselves over to uncleanness on account of their indiscriminate reading. The State protects the public health of its citizens by combating epidemics, sequestrating men and women afflicted with contagious diseases like smallpox, and restricting the sale of narcotics and poisons. The Church is bound to protect her children from the deadening and poisoning influence of the perverted written word.

A flippant unbeliever in a French review, *Comoedia*, wrote recently: "I agree with the wise man who said: 'There are no bad things to eat and drink; there are only bad stomachs.' So I would say: 'There are no bad books, but only bad minds that read them.'" I wonder what this Frenchman would say, if his cook put some arsenic in his morning chocolate.

In the New Testament we read of the converts at Ephesus burning about ten thousand dollars worth of magical books with the approval of St. Paul (Acts xix. 19). The Council of Nice in 325 condemned Arius' book, *Thalia*, and ordered all books containing the Arian heresy to be burned (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.*, i., 9). Pope Leo the Great (440-461) condemned the writings of the Priscillianists in Spain, and said that no one who read these books could be considered a good Catholic.

Every well-ordered State exercises some sort of censorship over the press, and enacts stringent laws against the circulation of immoral books and periodicals. This right of censorship has sometimes been abused, as in Prussia by Bismarck in his Kulturkampf, and in his campaign against the Socialists. In twelve years he banned some sixteen thousand books and pamphlets, more than the Index condemned in the whole nineteenth century. During the World War the most extreme censorship was exercised with regard to the public press, men's private correspondence, and the books which the soldiers were permitted to read. The Church is always at war with heresy, superstition, immorality and irreligion.

We can readily understand how the man without faith or morals himself can regard all censorship as an intolerant restraint upon his liberty. But the true Catholic will obey the laws of the Index, for he realizes that the Church is opposed not to liberty, but license. She is intolerant only of error and of sin. The Savior said: "The truth shall make you free. Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin" (John viii. 32, 34). The prudent gardener uproots noxious weeds to save his growing plants; the skillful surgeon cuts off the gangrened leg to save his patient's life.

It is true that the Church's leaders may make a mistake in placing a book upon the Index, but the one mistake made in the condemnation of Copernicus and Galileo is a clear testimony of the guidance of the Holy Ghost, even when the Church is giving a non-infallible decision. The *Divina Commedia* was never put on the Index, nor were the Psalms of David. A faulty translation of the Psalms by the heretic, Giovanni Diodati, was condemned—a totally different matter.

People of mature years are not immune from the evil effects of bad literature, as the history of many an apostate proves. The advocates of modern paganism are fully aware that a steady diet of irreligious or immoral books will sooner or later destroy the faith or morals of the most ardent Christian.

The lies Luther told in the sixteenth century are still going their rounds to-day, and the calumnies of anti-Catholic controversialists keep many a soul from the truth, as every priest can bear witness. The unbelieving critics of the Bible for the past hundred and fifty years have destroyed the faith of millions of one-time orthodox Christians. The written propaganda of the Bolshevists keeps their atheistic State in being, just as the lying press of Calles in Mexico kept the naturally fair-minded American people from realizing the murders and atrocities of this intolerant, modern Nero.

The ease with which so many millions accept the most immoral and irreligious teachings of the age, points clearly to the necessity of a guide that will tell them the difference between the true and the false, the moral and the immoral, the real Christianity and its counterfeit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Betten, *The Roman Index;* Donat, *The Freedom of Science,* 168-180; Hilgers, *The Roman Index;* Hurley, *Commentary on the Index.* C. E. iii. 519-527; vii. 721.—C. W. xlv. 55.—D. T. vii. 1570-1579.—M. Jan., 1927.

CREMATION

Why does the Catholic Church forbid cremation? I see nothing evil in it. Do not cemeteries infect the air, and poison the wells of a community?

The Church does not forbid cremation because it is intrinsically evil, but because it goes counter to the Jewish and Christian tradition, and was initiated by anti-Christians with the express purpose of destroying belief in the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body.

Cremation has been condemned by three Roman decrees. The first, May 16, 1886, forbids Catholics to join cremation societies or to order their bodies cremated; the second, December 15, 1886, deprives such Catholics of Christian burial; the third, July 27, 1892, forbids priests to give them the Last Sacraments. These decrees of the Holy Office condemn cremation, not as contrary to the divine or natural law, but as a "detestable pagan practice, introduced by men of doubtful faith," who aim at lessening Catholic reverence for the dead.

The constant practice of the Jews was to bury the dead either in the earth or in a rock tomb (Gen. xv. 15; xxiii. 19). Cremation has always been regarded by them with horror (Amos ii. 1), and was prescribed as a penalty only in certain flagrant cases of immorality (Gen. xxviii. 24), or of private looting in time of war (Josue vii. 15). The Catholic Church adopted the Jewish custom, and from the earliest times denounced "the cruel and atrocious custom of cremation" (Tertullian, *De Anima,* li.; Minucius Felix, *Octavius,* xi.; Origen, *Contra Celsum,* v. 23). The Fathers based their custom of burial on the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and the respect due it as the temple of the Holy Ghost (1 Cor. iii. 16; vi. 19).

The first attempt in modern times to revive cremation was made by the neo-pagans of the French Directory in the fifth year of the Republic. The project did not meet with any popular response at the time, although the spirit back of it was part of the Revolution's attack upon Christian doctrine, law and custom. The same scoundrels who put priests to death, abolished the Mass and the Sunday, and invented the new cult of reason, advocated cremation the better to destroy "the superstitions of the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body."

The world had to wait nearly seventy-five years before unbelief in Europe made another and more successful attempt to introduce cremation. The first cremations occurred at Padua in 1872, and at once anti-Christians everywhere began to found cremation societies, and to defend the practice in hundreds of books and pamphlets. The Freemason Ghisleri gives the reason in his

Almanacco dei Liberi Muratori: "Catholics have good reason to oppose cremation; this purification of the dead by means of fire will shake to its foundations Catholic predominance, based on the terror with which it has surrounded death." Another anti-Catholic Mason, Gorini, wrote in his *Purificazione dei Morti:* "Our task is not confined to the mere burning of the dead, but extends to burning and destroying superstition as well." He even advocated the selling of the ashes of the dead to farmers, saying: "The result would be that this common material would partially return to be re-incarnated in the bodies of the living Milanese. This is the only resurrection of the body recognized by science." Utterances of the same stamp in the Italian press for fifteen years prompted the Church's condemnation.

If cremation were adopted, many of the beautiful prayers and ceremonies of the Church would become altogether meaningless. Absolutely speaking, the Church could change her ritual in this respect, but it is not at all likely that she will. If, however, the State were to make cremation compulsory, canonists hold that the Church would readily adapt her prayers to the new method of disposing of the dead (Sanguinetti, *Institutes of Canon Law*).

Many jurists, physicians and insurance men are opposed to cremation, because it obliterates all traces of crime. Hoffman, in an article in the *Sanitarian,* January, 1901, has called attention to this phase of the question. From 1895 to 1899 out of the 528 persons cremated in St. Louis, Missouri, 64 died from accidents, violence or suicide. Autopsies performed three months after death have more than once furnished proof of poisoning, sufficient to send a criminal to the gallows.

Modern science denies that cemeteries cause infection either of the air, or of the wells and rivers (*C. E.,* iv., 483). The origin of all the plagues of history has been traced, not to the dead, but to the living. Although cremation was on the increase between the years 1872 to 1900, the annual average in the United States was only 13,230. There is little danger of its conquering the modern world, for it contradicts a sentiment too strongly imbedded in the human heart, and too strongly associated with the customs of centuries to be eradicated by flimsy arguments drawn from pseudo-science or blatant infidelity.

Bibliography: Augustine, *Commentary on Canon Law,* vi., 100; Conway, *The Ethics and History of Cremation;* Eassie, *Cremation of the Dead;* Lavrand, *La Crémation;* Martin, *Les Cimitiéres et la Crémation;* Thompson, *Modern Cremation.* A. Q. 1885, 678; 1886, 356.—C. C. x.-xii.—C. W. lxxiii. 453; cxvii. 721.—D. July, 1875; Jan., 1894; April, 1890.—D. A. ii. 628.—D. T. iii. 2310.—E. iv. 688; x. 229, 453.—M. May, 1875; May, 1884.—R. C. i. 68; iii. 279.—R. M. April 15, 1890; Nov. 1, 1895.

FREEMASONRY

Why have your Popes always so bitterly denounced Freemasons, and forbidden Catholics to join their lodges? Is it fair or just to condemn a social and charitable society, to which so many prominent and respectable citizens belong? Should not an exception have been made for English or American Freemasons, who have openly repudiated the atheism of the Grand Orient of France? Do not the Masons go back to King Solomon?

The Popes have condemned Freemasonry, because it is a religion of naturalism which ignores Jesus Christ, and has identified itself, especially in Latin countries, with deism and atheism; because its oaths are immoral in principle; because it has from the outset been the Catholic Church's most determined enemy.

Freemasonry was first condemned by Pope Clement XII in 1738, even though many prominent Catholics of the time belonged to the lodges, such as the Duke of Wharton, the Duke of Norfolk, the Chevalier Ramsay and others. To assert that Masonry goes back to King Hiram of Tyre, to King Solomon of Jerusalem, or to the Egyptian Pharaohs is legend, not history. It was originally a Jacobite political society which repudiated the Pretender, and founded the first Grand Lodge in London, 1717, under the patronage of the Prince of Wales. Its constitution and ritual were written by the Prince's Huguenot chaplain, aided by a Scotch Presbyterian minister. Its aim was mutual assistance, and the worship of "The Great Architect of the Universe," in which Jews, Christians and Mohammedans could equally participate. Begotten, as many believe (Findel, Lange) of English deism, it was taken up by French rationalists in 1721, who proceeded to organize its membership on a purely naturalistic basis. The Scottish Rite added thirty to the original three degrees; they were introduced in England by Preston in 1772, and in America by Webb in 1773.

The condemnation by Pope Clement XII was confirmed by Popes Benedict XIV (1751), Pius VII (1821), Leo XII (1836), Pius IX (1869) and Leo XIII (1884). All agreed that Masonry was a society that undermined the Catholic faith, fostered religious indifferentism and even advocated atheism, while fostering a universal contempt for all ecclesiastical authority. As Leo XIII said in his Encyclical *Humanum Genus:* "Its aim is the utter overthrow of that whole religious and political order of the world which the Christian teaching has produced, and the substitution of a new state of things in accordance with their ideas, of which the foundations and laws shall be drawn from pure naturalism" (*Encyclical Letters*, 89).

The "Old Charges" first printed in 1723 and revised in 1738, declare that Masons are "obliged to that religion to which all men agree, leaving their particular opinions to themselves"; and they contrast "this most ancient Catholic religion" with the one Christianity, the Church Catholic. No Catholic could subscribe to such views, and once they were fully grasped by reason of the Pope's ban, they at once repudiated Masonry (*v. g.*, O'Connell in Ireland). Pope Clement knew the facts, for an English-speaking lodge had been established in Rome as early as 1735, and Pritchard, in his *Masonry Detected,* had published their secrets to the world in 1730.

The Papal excommunication deprives the Catholic who joins the Masons of the Sacraments, of all share in the Church's public prayers, and finally of Christian burial. A good Catholic recognizes the Church's divine right to command under penalty of sin, because he believes that she is the divine teacher of Christ's revelation, and the divine guardian of morals. A private soldier obeys his superior officer, even if he does not perceive the reason or the wisdom of the orders given. It is certainly unreasonable to suppose that the Catholic Church, the great advocate of charity down the centuries, and the great defender of the natural right of association, would condemn any society on account of its benevolence or good-fellowship. Pope Clement XII also condemned the Masonic oath. The reasons are thus given by Father Thurston (*Freemasonry,* 11): "It is imposed by an authority which has no adequate sanction, different in that respect from the oath exacted, for example, by a magistrate, a judge, or an ecclesiastical superior, who are in their varying degrees the representatives of the commonwealth or of God. Again, the scope of the oath regards either secrets that are nowadays no secrets at all, or else secrets which are criminal and contrary to public polity. Thirdly, the manner of the oath-taking is irreverent, and in the extravagance of the penalties invoked borders on the blasphemous. Fourthly, by the form used the Mason may be said to pledge himself blindly to anything and everything, he knows not rightly what."

The avowed aim of continental Latin Masonry—the same holds good of Mexico, South and Central America and the Philippines—is to combat clericalism, *i. e.,* Catholicism, in every possible way. I have talked to Masons in France, Italy and Mexico, and they made no secret of their bitter hatred of the Catholic Church. Although they number but one-sixth of the total of 4,000,000 Masons, their militant character makes up for their numerical inferiority. No one will deny that the anti-religious legislation which has disgraced France the past fifty years, bringing about the closing of Catholic schools, the confiscation of Church property, and the exile of thousands of priests

and nuns was due to the Masons, who controlled both the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies. Of late (1929) they have been fighting the Church laws of Briand and Poincaré, who, for the political prestige of France, abroad, are trying to mete out scant justice to some of France's missionary religious orders. They are also doing their utmost to control the League of Nations, insolently asserting that the Church "fears it as a rival to her own teaching of reestablishing all things in Christ" (*Semaine de Defense Laïque,* December, 1923).

It is indeed true that many American Masons are utterly ignorant of the philosophy and religion of Masonry—a fact admitted by many of their leaders, such as Mackey, Pike, Oliver and others, as well as by Pope Leo XIII. The vast majority in this country join the Masons merely for business or social reasons, and rarely go beyond the first three degrees. They are often members and even ministers of the Christian churches, and reject with scorn the atheism of their Latin fellow craftsmen.

In 1878 the Grand Orient of France was repudiated by English and American Masons, because it erased from its ritual the section proclaiming the existence of God and the immortality of the soul, and omitted all mention of "the Grand Architect of the Universe." But the theism maintained by the protesting lodges is so vague and symbolical, that every kind of atheism can still be covered by it. A prominent leader of American Masonry, Pike, writes: "A man who has a higher conception of God than those about him, and who denies that their conception is God, is very likely to be called an atheist by men who are really far less believers in God than he" (*Morals and Dogma of the Scottish Rite,* 643). Another American Mason writes: "Individual members may believe in many gods, if their conscience and judgment so dictate" (Zabriskie in *Freemasons' Chronicle,* i., 243). In a word a Mason may believe what he pleases, for to him dogma is of no importance whatsoever.

The breach between English-speaking Masons and their atheistic French brethren is more apparent than real. For although in 1909 eight German Grand Lodges reestablished official friendly relations with the Grand Orient of France, there was no formal break between them and their English brethren. Or when after the World War, the Grand Lodges of Kentucky, Louisiana, Texas and Georgia, and the District of Columbia, recognized again the Grand Orient of France, they still remained united with their English brethren.

In fact Masonic authorities agree unanimously that Masonry throughout the world is in reality but one lodge, and that consequently every Mason in good standing is entitled to be received everywhere as a brother, and to be helped if in distress. Father Woodman, the well-known Paulist, told me that when in

visited France in the eighties as an Episcopalian Mason, he found no difficulty whatever in being admitted to an atheistic French lodge. American Masons are members of an international society, which in Latin countries identifies itself with anti-Catholicism. How then can they reasonably object to the Church's ban?

But even in the United States Masonry has voiced its antagonism to the Catholic Church, both in its official organs such as the *New Age* and *The American Freemason,* and in the writings of some of its prominent leaders.

The American Freemason says: "This magazine has never swerved from the position that between the Masonic fraternity and the Catholic Church there is an antagonism inherent in the nature of the organizations; the one seeking broadest liberty of thought, and the other striving to stifle all revolt against the self-constituted authority, that would hold mind and soul in thraldom. We have declared that there can be no true peace nor even truce between Freemasonry and the official Roman Church. They are opposing poles of thought; on the one side an authority that demands submission of will and conscience to a priestly caste, on the other an institution that insists upon individual freedom of thought, with no intermediary between God and man" (Quoted by Kenny, *American Masonry and Catholic Education*).

Pike, the American Pope of Masonry, in a letter to the Italian Grand Commander, Riboli, December 29, 1886, calls "the Papacy the torturer and curse of humanity for over a thousand years; the most shameful imposture in its pretence to spiritual power."

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Johnston, *Freemasonry;* Michel, *La Dictature de la Franc-Maçonnerie en France;* Passage, *Le Secret des Loges;* Preuss, *A Study in American Freemasonry;* Thurston, *Freemasonry.* A. Q. 1881, 577; 1898, 802.—C. E. ix. 771-786.—C. W. xxii. 145; xxx. 721.—D. July, 1884.—D. T. vi. 722-731.—E. June, July, August, 1907, 62.—R. C. iv. 85; xi. 275.—S. June 28.—T. Jan. 27, 1923.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Why are Catholics hostile to the public schools? Why do they have separate schools? Is this not un-American?

Do Catholics recognize the State's right to educate its citizens? Has the parent or the State the primary duty in education?

Catholics are not hostile to the public schools; they are critical of them—a totally different position. They cannot on

principle accept the present system of public education in the United States, because it does not give Catholic children the moral and religious training which they consider essential. As citizens who pay their proportionate share of the States' school tax, they have a right to criticize a defective State system of education.

The State has a right to insist upon its citizens being educated, but it has no right to hamper private initiative, or to establish a State monopoly in education. Provided religious and private schools accept the educational requirements which the State demands of its own schools, the State would interfere with the rights of parent and the rights of conscience were it to compel attendance upon its own public schools. This liberty of education was recognized as part of our Constitution by the Supreme Court, when it lately condemned the Oregon Law.

The parent has the primary duty in the education of the child. When the parent through negligence or lack of means fails to fulfill his duty, then the State has the right to compel its future citizens to attend its schools.

The principles which govern Catholics in the matter of education are well set forth in the *Pastoral Letter of the Bishops of the United States,* published in 1919. It says: "The right of the child to receive education and the correlative duty of providing it are established on the fact that man has a soul created by God, and endowed with capacities which need to be developed, for the good of the individual and the good of society. . . . Neither self-realization alone nor social service alone is the end of education, but rather these two in accordance with God's design, which gives to each of them its proportionate value. . . . Since the child is endowed with physical, intellectual and moral capacities, all these must be developed harmoniously. An education which quickens the intelligence and enriches the mind with knowledge, but fails to develop the will and direct it to the practice of virtue, may produce scholars, but it cannot produce good men. . . . Since the duties we owe our Creator take precedence of all other duties, moral training must accord the first place to religion, that is, to the knowledge of God and His law, and must cultivate a spirit of obedience to His commands. . . . Moral and religious training is most efficacious when it is joined with instruction in other kinds of knowledge. It should so permeate these that its influence will be felt in every circumstance of life. . . . An education that unites intellectual, moral and religious elements is the best training for citizenship. It inculcates a sense of responsibility, a respect for authority and a considerateness for the rights of others, which are the necessary foundation of civic virtue—more necessary where, as in a democ-

racy, the citizen, enjoying a larger freedom, has a greater obligation to govern himself. . . . There is reason to believe that this conviction is shared by a considerable number of our fellow-citizens who are not of the Catholic faith. They realize that the omission of religious instruction is a defect in education and also a detriment to religion."

The accusation frequently made that our schools are un-American is a calumny based on ignorance of the history of education in these United States, and of the ideals that prompt our educators.

The first American schools and colleges were religious schools. For over two hundred years all the colonial schools were church schools, and many of them, especially in the French and Spanish settlements, were Catholic schools. The modern system of tax-supported public schools dates only from 1850; it is simply one of the many systems, sanctioned alike by tradition and the Constitution.

Our parochial schools are American in every respect. Their curriculum is American; their teachers are American; their students are American, or on the way to be Americanized; their ideals are American, and utterly opposed to radicalism and Bolshevism; their loyalty is American, and has been proved to the hilt in every crisis of our nation's history.

It is hard to convince outsiders of the injustice done to Catholics by compelling them to pay a double tax. Catholics never have claimed State aid for teaching religion, for they know that Church and State are separate in America. But it certainly would be just for them to receive State aid for giving civic education to over two million children. The burden of our schools is tremendous, and could not possibly be borne, were it not for the self-devotedness of thousands of religious teachers, who are content with a most meagre salary, and the great generosity of the Catholic people. The Church must teach the faith to her children in virtue of her divine commission; the millions she spends annually for religious education are gladly given to train good Catholics and good Americans.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Burns, *Principles, Origin and Establishment of the Catholic School System in the U. S.; Growth and Development of the Catholic School System;* Dunney, *The Parish School;* Educational Pamphlets of the National Catholic Welfare Conference; Kinsman, *Americanism and Catholicism;* McCormick, *History of Education;* Ryan, *A Catechism of Catholic Education;* Shields, *The Philosophy of Education.* A. Q. 1879, 1; 1877, 240; 1884, 650, 713; 1886, 730; 1891. 441; 1892, 867; 1898, 225, 734.

EXCLUSIVE SALVATION

Does not your teaching "Outside the Church there is no salvation" imply that all non-Catholics go to hell?

It implies nothing of the kind. We believe that the Catholic Church is the one society for man's salvation instituted by Christ, and that, therefore, man must be affiliated with her in some way to be saved. That is what St. Cyprian meant when he said: "No one can have God for his Father, who has not the Church for his mother" (*On the Unity of the Church,* 6). But many souls, apparently outside the Church, are really within her fold in the sight of God. While not united with her *in fact,* they are in communion with her *in desire.*

The Church has always taught that no one is lost except through his own fault; that no one is held responsible by God for a duty that he cannot fulfill because of his invincible ignorance. How could God condemn a man for not entering a Church of whose very existence he is ignorant? Pope Pius IX states the Catholic doctrine clearly: "Far be it from us to dare set bounds to the boundless mercy of God; far be it from us to desire to search into the depths of the hidden counsels and judgments of God, an abyss that the mind of man cannot explore. . . . We must hold as of faith, that out of the Apostolic Roman Church there is no salvation; that she is the only ark of safety, and whosoever is not in her perishes in the deluge; we must also, on the other hand, recognize with certainty that those who are in invincible ignorance of the true religion are not guilty for this in the eye of the Lord. And who will presume to mark out the limits of this ignorance according to the character and diversity of peoples, countries, minds and the rest" (*Allocution,* December 9, 1854).

In his Encyclical to the Italian Bishops, August 10, 1863, he writes: "It is known to us and to you that those who are in invincible ignorance of our most holy religion, but who observe carefully the natural law, and the precepts graven by God upon the hearts of all men, and who being disposed to obey God lead an honest and upright life, may, aided by the light of divine grace, attain to eternal life; for God who sees clearly, searches and knows the heart, the disposition, the thoughts and intentions of each, in His supreme mercy and goodness by no means permits that anyone suffer eternal punishment, who has not of his own free will fallen into sin."

Intelligent non-Catholics have often recognized the boundless charity of the Catholic Church, which condemns only those who freely and deliberately sin against the light. Mallock writes: "Never was there a religious body except the Roman,

that laid the intense stress she does on all her dogmatic teachings, and had yet the justice that comes of sympathy for those who cannot receive them. . . . The holy and humble of heart who do not know her, or who in good faith reject her, she commits with confidence to God's uncovenated mercies; and these she knows are infinite. . . . Her anathemas are on none but those who reject her with their eyes open, by tampering with a conviction that she is really the truth. These are condemned, not for seeing that the teacher is true, but because, having really seen this, they continue to close their eyes to it" (*Is Life Worth Living?*, ch. xi., 283-285).

Bibliography: Bainvel, *Is There Salvation Outside the Church?*; Dublanchy, *Extra Ecclesiam non est Salus;* Hugon, *Hors de l'Eglise point de Salut;* Knox, *The Belief of Catholics,* xviii. C. W. xlvii. 145; xlviii. 351, 569.—D. April, 1908.—R. C. xxi. 639.

SALVATION OF PAGANS

Does your Church teach that all pagans are damned? Your Council of Trent teaches that after the promulgation of the Gospel no one can be saved without Baptism (Sess. vi., cap. 4). What about the millions of pagans who before and after Christ never heard of Baptism? Are they not all kept from heaven by their original sin?

The Catholic Church does not teach that all pagans are damned. Luther indeed damned the pagan philosophers, "even though they had been virtuous in their inmost soul." He held that even their good works were sins, because they had no faith in Christ, and their virtues were tainted by Original Sin (Grisar, *Luther,* i., 101; iii., 213).

The Catholic Church, on the contrary, teaches that "God will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. ii. 4); that God gives sufficient grace to all men to be saved; that unbelief is never sinful unless it is voluntary.

Our questioner does not quote the Council of Trent accurately. It teaches "that no one can be brought from original sin into the grace of God, unless by Baptism *or the desire for it.*" The pagan may never have heard of Baptism, and therefore the Gospel has not been promulgated as far as he is concerned. He must needs be saved by "the desire of Baptism." St. Thomas clearly teaches that a pagan "obtains the remission of his original sin through grace, once he has turned (has ordered himself) to God his Last End" (IIa. IIæ., Q. 89, a. 6).

The pagan must have faith as a necessary means of salvation, for "without faith it is impossible to please God" (Heb. xi. 6). The Apostle immediately adds that he must accept two fundamental articles of faith, *viz.,* the existence of God, and His rewarding Providence. "For he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and is a Rewarder to them that seek Him."

This divine gift of faith will be given to every well disposed soul, who is invincibly ignorant of the Gospel. Pope Clement XI condemned as heretical the teaching of Quesnel, who said that "no grace is given outside the Church." On the contrary, just as all fell in Adam, so all were elevated to the supernatural order through Christ, as St. Paul teaches (Rom. v. 18; *Cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 22). This implies that the saving grace of Christ's Redemption is given to all men, illuminating their minds, and moving their wills, so that they turn to God as the True End of their being. If they are responsive to the divine inspiration, they receive sanctifying grace which remits their Original Sin, and if they offend grievously afterwards, the grace of perfect contrition.

The pagan, however, is not saved by his good faith, but by divine faith; *i. e.,* he must accept the revealed truths of God, explicitly with regard to God's existence and His rewarding Providence, implicitly with regard to all other dogmas. Believing in a supernatural Providence, the pagan by the very fact believes implicity in Jesus Christ the One Mediator, because he has accepted all the means of salvation that God has provided, the chief being Christ's Death on the Cross for the salvation of the world. Faith in the present order of divine Providence means *a faith of Christ* and *a faith in Christ,* because this virtue together with hope and charity is given mankind, only in view of the infinite merits of our Savior.

This question is treated from the standpoint of both history and theology in the two scholarly volumes of the Abbé Caperan, *Le Problème du Salut des Infidèles.*

ATTENDANCE AT NON-CATHOLIC SERVICES

Is it not inconsistent for you to invite Protestants to attend doctrinal lectures in your Church, and yet at the same time to forbid Catholics to attend lectures in our churches, or take part in our services?

There is no inconsistency in our attitude. A Catholic would violate Catholic principles by attending services in a Protestant church, whereas a Protestant violates no principle of his religion by attending doctrinal lectures on Catholicism.

Protestantism is essentially a religion based on private judgment; a Protestant is logically a seeker after truth. In view of the many doctrinal divisions among the sects, and the many different viewpoints of liberal thought, the logical thinker in the outside churches can never be certain of his position. He must at least admit that the Catholic Church may be the one Church of Christ.

Catholicism is essentially a religion based on a divine, infallible teaching; a Catholic is logically a possessor of the truth. Why, therefore, should he seek for that which he already possesses? His faith precludes all possibility of doubt; it rests on the authority of God. He can never admit that other churches, liberal or orthodox, may possibly be right.

A Congregationalist minister once said to the writer: "What is better than searching for the truth?" "Finding it" was my answer.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. G. May, 1923.

THE FALL AND ORIGINAL SIN

Must Catholics accept the story of the apple and the serpent in Genesis literally? Why should such a trivial matter as eating an apple be punished so severely? What do Catholics mean by the Fall of Adam? Does not your doctrine of Original Sin imply an unjust God, who holds us responsible for the sin of Adam?

The Catholic Church teaches that our first parents, Adam and Eve, were endowed by God with sanctifying grace, and with certain preternatural gifts, such as freedom from concupiscence, freedom from pain and death, and a high degree of knowledge. These gifts were dependent on their obedience to a moral command, proportionate to their knowledge of God and His will. We read in Genesis that God commanded Adam not to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, threatening him with death if he disobeyed (Gen. ii. 17); and that Adam deliberately did disobey this express command (Gen. ii. 1-6). The tempter was the devil in the form of a serpent, as we learn from St. Paul and St. John (2 Cor. xii. 3; Apoc. xii. 9; xx. 2). Adam's sin was a sin of pride (Gen. iii. 22), and consisted in a formal disobedience to God and the law of probation (Rom. v. 19). The eating of an apple was a trivial thing in itself, but God made it a supreme test of loyalty. It was a grievous sin, because Adam could easily have avoided it, as there was in him neither ignorance nor concupiscence, and he certainly knew, as head of the race, what terrible consequences would follow for all mankind.

The Biblical Commission, June 30, 1900, declared that Catholics may not call into doubt the literal meaning of Genesis with regard to "the original happiness of our first parents, the command given by God to test their obedience, their disobedience of this command at the instigation of the devil, and the loss of their primitive state of innocence." If these facts are admitted, there is no strict obligation imposed of accepting all the minute details of their setting.

The consequences of Adam's sin are thus stated by the Council of Trent: "The first man Adam, having transgressed the mandate of God in Paradise, at once lost the sanctity and justice in which he had been constituted; incurred, through the offence of his prevarication, the anger and indignation of God, and, therefore, the death with which God had previously threatened him, and together with death, captivity under the power of him who thenceforth had the empire of death, that is, of the devil; Adam, through the offence of that prevarication, underwent a complete change for the worse in body and soul" (Sess. v., can. 8).

The human race is a unit, summed up in its head Adam, and, therefore, the Church has ever taught that Adam's sin with all its effects was transmitted to all mankind. This was taught explicitly by the Council of Carthage in 418, the Council of Orange in 529, and the Council of Trent in 1546 (Sess. v., can. 1-4). "If any one assert that the prevarication of Adam was hurtful to himself only, and not to his progeny; and that he lost for himself only, and not for us, the sanctity and justice received from God; or that being himself defiled by the sin of disobedience, he transmitted to all mankind only death and the sufferings of the body, but not the sin which is the death of the soul, let him be anathema, for he contradicts the Apostle, who says: 'Wherefore as by one man sin entered into this world, and by sin death, etc.'" (Rom. v. 12-18).

The dogma of Original Sin is clearly taught by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans (v. 12-21). Not content with declaring that death comes from Adam (1 Cor. xv. 21, 22), he here asserts, while comparing the transgression of Adam with the grace of Christ's Redemption, that Adam's sin was transmitted to all mankind. "As by the offence of one, unto all men to condemnation; so also by the justice of One, unto all men to justification of life. For as by the disobedience of one man, many were made sinners; so also by the obedience of One, many shall be made just" (Rom. v. 18, 19).

Original Sin is indeed a great mystery, which the human reason cannot fathom, but it does not imply any injustice on the part of God. Original Sin did not injure man in anything that was natural to him. All the supernatural and preternatural

gifts that Adam lost for himself and for us were not his or ours by right, but were given Adam gratuitously by God, on the one condition that Adam was to obey His easy commandment. "Original Sin is not an evil bias, a tendency to wrong, a taint in spirit or in flesh, a corruption of any part of human nature as such. Concupiscence, the natural activity of instincts or passions not subordinate to reason, is not Original Sin, but a consequence of it, even though it may lead, often enough, to actual sin" (Martindale, *The Faith of the Roman Church*, 84). There would have been injustice only if God had imputed to us another's personal sin, or had deprived us of something due to human nature, as Luther taught. As Faà de Bruno says: "It is not the sin of Adam inasmuch as that was personal which God imputes, but the necessary effect of that sin *i. e.*, the deprivation and the rejection, as it were, of original justice, which Adam willfully incurred as the head of the whole human race, and which, therefore, we also, as united to Adam, have incurred. In this no vestige of injustice appears" (*Catholic Belief*, 349).

Bibliography: Feldmann, *Paradies und Sünderfall;* Johnson; *Anthropology and the Fall;* Labauche, *God and Man,* ii., 5-122; McDonough, *The Fall of Man;* Miller, *The Fall of Man;* Northcote, *The Curse of Adam;* O'Connor, *Original Sin.* C. W. iv. 454, 519; xxx. 838.—I. T. Oct., 1908; July, 1909; April, 1911.—R. C. xii. 174, xviii. 85; xxxvii. 217.

GRACE

Is human nature capable of reasoning about God, or of performing good deeds of itself? Was Calvin right in holding that *all* the acts of sinners are sins? Can man of himself work out his own salvation? Can we be certain that we are saved souls?

The Catholic Church condemns equally the heresy of Pelagius, who taught that human nature of itself could perform all acts necessary to salvation, and the heresy of Calvin who held that *all* the acts of sinners were sins (*Council of Trent*, Sess. vi., canons 1-7). She has ever defended the rights of reason and human nature against the Reformers of the sixteenth century, and the rights of faith and supernature against ancient paganism and modern rationalism.

The Catholic Church teaches that a knowledge of God and the moral law is within the reach of our natural powers (Vatican Council, Sess. iii., *De Rev.*, can. 1; *Cf.* Wisd. iii. 5; Rom. i. 20,

ii. 14). The power of willing and of performing good works is instinctive to man. St. Paul says: "When the Gentiles who have not the law, do by nature the things that are of the law; these, having not the law, are a law to themselves . . . their conscience bearing witness to them" (Rom. ii. 14). God rewards the good deeds of the pagans (Exod. i. 21; Ezech. xxix. 18), and our Lord recognizes the natural love and friendship of the pagans as something good (Matt. v. 47).

The grace of God, a supernatural gift bestowed upon us through the merits of Christ's Passion and Death, is absolutely necessary for us to attain eternal life. Grace is necessary for the beginning of faith; it is necessary for the just man to persevere in the grace he has already received; it is necessary for him to avoid all venial sins. St. Paul teaches the necessity of grace for salutary thoughts, resolves and actions. All right *thinking* is from God: "Not that we are sufficient to think anything of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God" (2 Cor. iii. 5). The righteous *will* must rest on the divine mercy: "So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy" (Rom. ix. 16). The righteous *action* is from beginning to end from God: "It is God who worketh in you both to will and to accomplish" (Phil. ii. 13). He ascribes all his virtue, and all the wonderful results of his missions to the grace of God: "By the grace of God I am what I am; and His grace in me hath not been void, but I have labored more abundantly than all they; yet not I, but the grace of God with me" (1 Cor. xv. 10).

The Apostle is merely repeating the teaching of Christ, who said: "As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, unless it abide in the vine, so neither can you, unless you abide in Me. . . . Without Me you can do nothing" (John xv. 4, 5).

Actual grace is required that we may be strengthened in the hour of conflict (Rom. vii. 19), but sanctifying grace is also needed to preserve us from sin. "The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath delivered me from the law of sin and death" (Rom. viii. 2). Sanctifying grace is a permanent quality of the soul, whereby we share the divine life (John xiv. 6; xv. 5), become partakers of the Divine Nature (2 Peter i. 4), receive the adoption of the sons of God (Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 5; Eph. i. 5; 1 John i. 3; 1 Peter i. 23; James i. 13), and are made temples of the Holy Spirit (Rom. v. 1; viii. 11; 1 Cor. iii. 16; vi. 19).

The gift of final perseverance is so much the gift of God, that the Council of Trent taught against Luther that, apart from some special revelation, we can never be sure of it "with absolute and infallible certainty" (Sess. vi., can. 16). As St. Paul tells us, "we must work out our salvation in fear and

trembling" (Phil. ii. 12), and although he says "Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ," he adds: "I chastise my body, and bring it into subjection, lest perhaps, when I have preached to others, I myself should become a castaway" (1 Cor. ix. 27).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Joyce, *The Catholic Doctrine of Grace;* Towers, *Actual Grace.* D. T. vi. 1554-1617.

JUSTIFICATION

Does not St. Paul teach that a man is justified by faith? "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law" (Rom. iii. 28). And again: "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (v. 1).

It is perfectly true that we are justified by faith, but not by faith "alone" as Luther impudently perverted this text (Rom. iii. 28). We are justified by a faith that worketh by charity (Gal. v. 6). Möhler shows how Luther totally misunderstood the meaning of St. Paul. He writes: "St. Paul here contends against the Jews of his time, who obstinately defended the eternal duration of the Mosaic law, and asserted that, not needing a Redeemer from sin, they became righteous and acceptable before God by that law alone. In opposition to this opinion, St. Paul lays down the maxim, that it is not by the deeds of the law, that is, not by a life regulated by the Mosaic precepts, is man able to obtain the favor of heaven; but only through faith in Christ, which has been imparted to us by God for wisdom, for sanctification, for righteousness, and for redemption. Unbelief in the Redeemer, and confidence in the fulfillment of the law performed through natural power on the one hand, and faith in the Redeemer and the justice to be conferred by God on the other (Rom. i. 17; x. 3; Phil. iii. 9)—these, and not faith in the Redeemer, and the good works emanating from His power, constitute the two points of opposition contemplated by the Apostle" (*Symbolism,* ch. iii., 165).

Luther and Calvin held that justification was a purely external process. When the merits of Christ's Redemption were applied to the soul, no internal change took place in the sinner; he did not thereby become any better than he was before. His sins were merely covered by Christ's merits, which were imputed to him as though they were his own. This fundamental heresy, which struck at the very heart of Christianity, has no warrant in either the Gospels or in the Epistles of St. Paul, St. John and St. Peter. The Council of Trent declared against the Reformers

(Sess. vi., ch. 7) that "justification is not merely the remission of sin, but the sanctification and renovation of the interior man by his voluntary acceptance of graces and gifts; whence the unjust is made just, the enemy a friend, that he be made the heir according to the hope of life everlasting" (Tit. iii. 7). . . . We are not merely reputed just (by a legal fiction), the Council adds, "but are so in name and fact, receiving in ourselves, everyone according to his measure, the justice which the Holy Ghost divideth to everyone according as He will (1 Cor. xii. 11), and according to everyone's disposition and cooperation. For although no one can be just unless the merits of the Passion of Christ be communicated to him, yet this communication takes place in the justification of the sinner when, by the merit of the said holy Passion, the charity of God is diffused by the Holy Ghost in the hearts of those who are justified, and *is inherent in them.* Whence in the act of justification, with the remission of his sins, man receives all at once, through Christ, on whom he is ingrafted, the infused gifts of faith, hope and charity. For faith without hope or charity, neither unites man perfectly with Christ, nor makes him a living member of His Body."

St. John describes the grace produced by justification as a new life, really communicated to the faithful (John iii. 5; vi. 52; xv. 5), implying freedom from sin (viii. 34-36), and a divine peace that in Christ will overcome the world (xiv. 27; xvi. 33). St. Paul calls our justification the resurrection of the soul (Col. iii. 1), which makes us the adopted sons of God, "heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ" (Rom. viii. 16, 17). He identifies it with our "regeneration and renovation" by the Holy Ghost (Tit. iii. 5), and, in his striking parallelism between the first and the second Adam, he shows that Christ imparts justice to our souls just as truly as Adam transmitted original sin (Rom. v. 19).

Luther's teaching that faith alone justifies (*Augsburg Confession,* iv., *De Just.,* 26) was condemned by the Council of Trent (Sess. vi., can. 12), because it clearly contradicted the Sacred Scriptures. "Faith without works is dead," says St. James (ii. 16). Faith with Luther meant a man's confidence that his sins had been forgiven by God for Christ's sake, whereas Christ and His Apostles always taught that faith implied the acceptance of all God's revelation on His word (Mark i. 15; xvi. 16; Luke xviii. 8; xxiv. 25-28; John xi. 25-27; Rom. iii. 22-25; ix. 30-33; Eph. iii. 8-12; Heb. xi. 6). Without faith justification is impossible; it is "the root of all justification, the beginning and the foundation of man's salvation." Other dispositions are required, for faith necessarily leads to action. We must not only believe, but we must hope, repent and love (Trent, Sess. vi., ch. vi.; *Cf.* can. 9). "We are saved by hope" (Rom.

viii. 24). "Do penance and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins" (Acts ii. 38). "If I have all faith so as to move mountains and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing" (1 Cor. xiii. 2).

Bibliography: Heinrich-Gutberlet, *Dogmatiche Theologie,* viii., 477-550; Joyce, *The Catholic Doctrine of Grace,* 119-141; Labauche, *God and Man,* ii., 203-253. C. W. vi. 433.—D. T. viii. 2042-2227.—R. C. vi. 468.

IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS

Does not St. Paul clearly speak of imputed righteousness? "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin" (Rom. iv. 7, 8)?

No, he does not, for the Psalm quoted (xxxi.) is David's thanksgiving for having his sin "taken away" from him (2 Kings xii. 13); it is a poetical effusion of the heart, and not a scientific statement of the process of justification. Of a stain blotted out by the power of God, the poet may well say that it is "covered" and it is "not imputed." In fact the parallelism of the first verse requires that the second half should have the same sense as the first. But in the first hemistich sins are spoken of as "forgiven," therefore in the second the word "covered" has the same sense. Lastly, what is "covered" from the eyes of the Lord does not exist (Wilhelm-Scannell, *A Manual of Catholic Theology,* ii., 255).

The Lutheran doctrine that God does not impute a sin which really exists is a contradiction in terms, never met with in the Bible. When God forgives sins, they are taken away (2 Kings xii. 13), blotted out (Isa. xliii. 25), exhausted (Heb. ix. 28), removed from us as far as the East is from the West (Ps. cii. 12), to be put away and cast into the bottom of the sea (Mich. vii. 19).

MERIT

Does not the Catholic doctrine of merit dishonor the Redemption of Christ, by ascribing salvation to one's personal efforts? Did He not teach that we have no claim to any reward? "When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say: 'We are

unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do' (Luke xvii. 10). Does not your teaching imply that God is under obligation to us, as a creditor to a debtor? Is not eternal life our inheritance, and a free gift of God? For 'by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God. Not of works, lest any man should boast" (Eph. ii. 8, 9).

Merit is the value attached by God to our good deeds, which we freely perform by the help of divine grace. The Church has always taught that the doctrine of merit rested, not, as Luther falsely asserted, on any absolute right to reward in the works themselves, but on the express promise of God to reward faithful service to Him by grace here and glory hereafter.

It is indeed absurd to speak of God as our debtor, for our deeds can bring Him no advantage. We owe all we have and are to God. But the Scriptures plainly teach that if our good works are freely done in His honor and service, aided always by His divine grace, they are indeed meritorious according to His divine plan. All our merit is primarily His, for He won our right to grace and glory by His Infinite merits, when He redeemed us by His Passion and Death.

Eternal life is our inheritance as adopted sons of God, but it is also our reward. "Knowing that you shall receive the reward of inheritance" (Col. iii. 24). Eternal life is a free grace, but that merely proves that grace is necessary to merit it. As St. Augustine says: "When God crowns our merits, He crowns His own gifts" (*Epis.*, 194, 19).

The parable of our Lord in Luke (xvii. 7-10) has no reference whatever to the question of merit; it simply teaches us a lesson of humility, as Father Lagrange has pointed out (*Evangile selon S. Luc,* 456).

The Council of Trent thus states the Catholic doctrine: "Eternal life is to be proposed to those who do good unto the end and hope in God, both AS A GRACE mercifully promised to the children of God through Jesus Christ, and AS A REWARD to be faithfully rendered to their good works and merits, in virtue of the promise of God Himself (2 Tim. iv. 7). . . . For since Christ Jesus Himself constantly communicated His virtue to those who are justified, as the Head to the members (Eph. iv. 15), and as the Vine to the branches (John xv. 4), which virtue always preceded, accompanied and followed their good works, and without which they could be nowise agreeable to God and meritorious; we must believe that nothing more is wanting to the justified, nor is there any reason why they should not be considered as having fully satisfied the divine law, as far as the condition of this life admits, by such works as are done

in God, and truly merited the attainment of eternal life in due time, if they die in the state of grace" (Sess. vi., ch. xvi.).

The doctrine of merit is expressly taught in many passages of the New Testament. "I was hungry and you gave Me to eat" (Matt. xxv. 42). "Sell what you possess and give alms; make to yourself bags which grow not old, a treasure in heaven which faileth not" (Luke xii. 33; *Cf.* xiv. 9-13). "Who will render to every man according to his works" (Rom. ii. 6). "Every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labors" (1 Cor. iii. 8). "Know you not that they that run in the race, all run indeed, but one receiveth the prize? So run that you may obtain" (1 Cor. xii. 24). "For that which is at present momentary and light of our tribulations worketh for us above measure an eternal weight of glory" (2 Cor. iv. 17). "Godliness is profitable to all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come" (1 Tim. iv. 8). "Therefore let us consider one another to provoke to charity and good works. For patience is necessary for you, that doing the will of God, you may receive the promise; for He is faithful that hath promised" (Heb. x. 23, 24, 36). "Labor the more that by good works you may make sure your calling and election" (2 Peter i. 10). "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life" (Apoc. ii. 10). "My reward is with Me to render to every man according to his works" (Apoc. xxii. 12).

Erasmus pointed out to Luther that his denial of free will rendered all laws and all commandments, even those of the Scriptures, superfluous, and his absolute determinism negatived all spontaneous, meritorious action on man's part. Luther's ridicule of "the Popish doctrine of merit which makes God our debtor" is rather silly, and was answered over a thousand years before by St. Augustine. "God has become our debtor, not as though He has received something from us, but because He has promised what pleased Him. It is a different thing when we say to a man: 'You are my debtor because I have given you something, and when we say to God: Give us what Thou hast promised, for we have done what Thou didst command' " (Ser. 150, c. 2).

Luther's continual denunciation of good works in the name of a pseudo-evangelical freedom had a disastrous effect on public morals, as he and many of his contemporaries admitted. He writes: "This preaching ought rightfully to be accepted and listened to with great joy, and everyone ought to improve himself thereby and become more pious. But unfortunately, the reverse is now the case, and the longer it endures the worse the world becomes; this is the work of the devil himself, for now we see the people becoming more avaricious, more unmerciful, more unchaste, and in every way worse than they were under

the Papacy" (*Cf.* Grisar, *Luther,* iv., 210; *Cf.* 195-218; 464-472).

Bibliography: Joyce, *The Catholic Doctrine of Grace,* 158-179; Remler, *Supernatural Merit.* C. W. vii. 125.

THE SACRAMENTS

Do Catholics believe that God's gifts and graces are limited to the seven Sacraments? Is not your sacramental teaching medieval? What did primitive Christianity know of the scholastic terms of "matter" and "form"? Are not the Sacraments hindrances to real religion, making it dependent upon a meaningless ritual?

The very definition of a Sacrament proves that it is not a meaningless ritual, for a Sacrament is a visible sign instituted by Christ, signifying and producing sanctifying grace in the soul. Three elements constitute a Sacrament: 1. The visible sign; *v. g.,* the external washing of water (by pouring, sprinkling or immersion) in Baptism with the invocation of the Blessed Trinity aptly signifies the internal cleansing of the soul from original and actual sin. 2. The producing of interior grace; *v. g.,* Baptism produces sanctifying grace in the soul, so that "by water and the Holy Ghost," as our Lord taught, we are supernaturally born into the kingdom of God (John iii. 5; *Cf.* Acts ii. 38; xxii. 16). 3. The institution of Christ; *v. g.,* the Apostolic commission includes the command to baptize (Matt. xxviii. 16).

God's grace, although it ordinarily comes to us by Christ's institution through the Mass and seven Sacraments, is not denied to a non-Catholic who does not know of their existence, or to a Catholic who cannot receive them because no priest is available at the hour of death. God gives sufficient grace to everyone to be saved, as St. Paul teaches: "He will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. ii. 4). Many a High Church Episcopalian convert has asked me whether the graces he felt he had received in past communions were a mere mockery. "Not in the least," I answered, "for you have been making spiritual communions in good faith, even though you did not realize that your minister was a mere layman going through an empty form."

It is true indeed that the terms "matter" and "form" were not applied to the Sacraments until the thirteenth century, but the idea conveyed by these words dates from St. Augustine (Tract. lxxx., *In Joan.,* 3). These philosophical terms were bor-

rowed from Aristotle, and their use confirmed by the Councils of Constance, Florence and Trent. They do not imply, as some non-Catholics seem to imagine, that the Sacraments are material, corporeal things. "What they mean is that just as bodies are composed of two constituents, the one indeterminate and the other determining, so too in the Sacraments two elements, the one indeterminate and the other determining, can be distinguished; and these may rightly be called "matter" and "form" (Wilhelm-Scannell, *Manual of Theology*, ii., 361). In Baptism, the washing with water is the "matter," while the words used in baptizing (I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost), which show why the water is being used, and what it symbolizes, is the "form."

It is of faith that Christ instituted the seven Sacraments (Trent, Sess. vii., *De Sac.*, can. 1), but it is also clear from the history of both East and West that He did not determine, save in a most general way, the matter and form of certain Sacraments such as Confirmation, Orders and Extreme Unction. He allowed the Church to determine them with precision. The Sacraments of the Eastern Orthodox Church are perfectly valid, although they use a different form of Confirmation (the seal of the gift of the Holy Ghost, Amen), employ a deprecatory form of absolution in the Sacrament of Penance (may this same God, through me a sinner, forgive you all, both now and forever), and confer Orders by laying on the right hand only (Fortescue, *The Orthodox Eastern Church*, 418-428).

The Sacraments, instead of being hindrances to religion, are on the contrary the greatest possible divine helps to sanctify our souls, for they apply the infinite merits of Christ's Redemption to us. When we are dead in sin they give us the divine life in the Sacraments of the Dead (Baptism and Penance), and, when we are in the state of grace, they give us the divine life more abundantly (John x. 10) in the Sacraments of the Living (Confirmation, Extreme Unction, Orders, Matrimony and the Holy Eucharist).

The Sacrament of Penance has reconciled millions of sinners to God, strengthening their faith, enlivening their hope, and intensifying their love of Christ Jesus. The unbelieving Harnack rightly accuses Protestantism of "culpable folly" in depriving souls of its power for good (*Reden und Aufsatze*, ii., 256). Holy Communion unites the soul with Christ in a most intimate bond, and Jesus really and truly present in us (John vi. 57) is the origin and incentive of every virtue. Protestants have called the Holy Eucharist "the culminating point of Catholic piety. In It the Catholic life of prayer attains that depth, fervor and strength, which only he knows, who has himself experienced it" (Heiler, *Das Wesen des Katholizismus*, 105).

Christianity is a sacramental religion. Christ is God and Man. The Word was made Flesh and dwelt among us that the sons of men might through His Passion and Death become the sons of God. His Church is visible and invisible, with a divine and a human element. We, the members of the Church, are not disembodied spirits, but creatures of body and soul. We therefore naturally expect the life of the Church to be a supernatural life so given by Christ, as to make visible human things at once the signs and the causes of things invisible and divine. The ritual of the Sacraments cannot be meaningless, for they all signify the grace of God, and effect it in our souls.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Adam, *The Spirit of Catholicism,* 184-192; Ayrinhac, *Legislation on the Sacraments;* Devine, *The Sacraments Explained;* Doyle, *The Wonderful Sacraments;* Martindale, *The Sacramental System;* Pohle, *The Sacraments,* i., 5-18; Probst, *Sakramenten und Sakramentalien;* Pourrat, *Theology of the Sacraments,* 1-92.

THE EFFICACY OF THE SACRAMENTS

I believe that the Sacraments merely serve to strengthen faith, and that they have no intrinsic power. Are not the Sacraments "mere tokens of the divine promise that sins were to be forgiven by faith" (Luther)?, "mere messengers announcing to men God's deeds of kindness" (Calvin)?, "mere signs of Christian profession" (Zwingli)?

No, these teachings of the Reformers were explicitly condemned by the Council of Trent (Sess. viii., canons 1-12). It is of faith that the Sacraments contain the grace they signify, and confer that grace on those who do not place an obstacle thereunto, and that grace is conferred by the Sacraments of themselves *ex opere operato.*

The false views of the Reformers on justification led logically to their denial of the objective efficacy of the Sacraments. If faith alone justifies, and justification consists in a merely extrinsic application of the merits of Christ without producing any interior change in the soul, the Sacraments are intended only to stimulate faith, and are really not at all necessary for salvation. There is no warrant in either the Bible or Tradition for this false theory.

The New Testament always represents the Sacraments as efficacious means for the forgiveness of sins, and the imparting of the grace of God. St. Peter tells the convert Jews that they must do penance and be baptized "in the name of Jesus Christ

for the remission of their sins, and that they shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts ii. 38). Ananias says to the convert Saul of Tarsus, "Rise up and be baptized and wash away thy sins, invoking the name of Christ" (Acts xxii. 16). St. Paul in many passages speaks of the efficacy of Baptism, which cleanses us from all sins, gives us salvation "by the laver of regeneration and renovation of the Holy Ghost," so that we may "walk in newness of life," having become "new creatures" and "adopted sons" (Rom. vi. 3, 4; vii. 15-17; 1 Cor. vi. 9-11; Gal. vi. 15; Eph. v. 27; Titus iii. 5).

Our Savior clearly taught the objective efficacy of Baptism, when He told Nicodemus that the Holy Ghost with water is the agent of our spiritual regeneration. "Amen, amen I say to thee, unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John iii. 5).

After Baptism, the Apostles administered Confirmation: "They laid hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost" (Acts viii. 17; *Cf.* xix. 6). This giving of the Holy Ghost implied an interior sanctification of the soul, as St. Paul teaches: "The charity of God is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, who is given to us" (Rom. v. 5; *Cf.* viii. 9-28).

St. John records Christ's own words with regard to the efficacy of the Sacrament of the Eucharist. It is the real Body and Blood of Christ, the spiritual food of every Christian. He abides in us and we in Him; He communicates to us the divine life, and is the efficacious means of our gaining eternal life, and sharing in His Resurrection (John vi. 54-59).

St. Paul, writing to Timothy, teaches the objective efficacy of the Sacrament of Orders. "Stir up the grace which is in thee by the imposition of my hands" (2 Tim. i. 6).

The teaching of the Fathers from the Shepherd of Hermas in the second century to St. Augustine in the fifth may be studied in Pourrat's *Theology of the Sacraments,* 103-156. St. Ignatius of Antioch (100) calls the Eucharist "the medicine of immortality and the antidote, so that we do not die, but live forever in Jesus Christ" (Eph. xx. 2). Tertullian (200) says of Baptism: "Happy the Sacrament of our water, whereby, being cleansed from the sins of our former blindness, we are made free unto eternal life. . . . Is it not wonderful that death should be washed away by a bath?" (*De Bapt.*, ch. 1). St. Augustine says: "Baptism does not consist in the merits of those by whom it is administered, nor in the merits of those to whom it is administered, but in its own sanctity and truth, on account of Him by whom it has been instituted. It is for the perdition of those who use it badly, and for the salvation of those who use it well" (*Contra Cres.*, iv., 16, 19).

The mind of the Church may be learned from her constant

practice. Unless the Sacrament of Baptism, for example, conferred grace of itself, it would have been useless to have conferred it upon infants, the insane, and the unconscious. In the early Church it was customary to give the Holy Eucharist to infants, and I have seen Bishops in Mexico City give them Confirmation.

Bibliography: Pohle, *The Sacraments*, i., 121-142; Pourrat, *Theology of the Sacraments*, 93-203.

Do not Catholics attribute a magical effect to the Sacraments by teaching that they confer grace of themselves?

Not at all. The Catholic Church condemns magic as a mortal sin against the virtue of religion, and brands it as an immoral attempt to work miracles by the power of the devil. We call an action magical, when an inadequate and insufficient cause is expected to produce a higher effect; when what is material or created is regarded as the cause of something spiritual or divine.

The efficacy of the Sacraments does not depend upon the one who administers them, nor upon humanly devised formulas, which compel God to act in a certain way; they depend solely upon Jesus Christ who instituted them for our salvation. The Sacraments derive their efficacy from their immediate relation not only to the Precious Blood of Christ (Col. i. 19; Heb. ix. 13; 1 Peter i. 2), but also to His Sacred Person, in whose name the human minister acts (1 Cor. i. 13; iii. 4; iv. 1). The effects, therefore, are divine in their origin, and helpful to the moral and religious life of those who receive them. Magic is of the devil, and essentially immoral.

Bibliography: Mausbach, *Catholic Moral Teaching*, 327; Pohle, *The Sacraments*, i., 136. C. G. Nov., 1928.

THE SACRAMENTAL CHARACTER

Why do Catholics believe that Baptism, Confirmation and Orders cannot be repeated?

Because, as the Council of Trent teaches, they impress upon the soul a character, *i. e.*, a spiritual and indelible sign, which negatives a second reception of these Sacraments. St. Paul describes the action of the Holy Spirit in the baptized Christian under the symbol of a seal (Eph. i. 13). He tells them again that they will share in the Redemption of Christ, because they

have been stamped with "the seal" of the Holy Ghost (Eph. iv. 30). St. Augustine taught that Baptism, even when given by heretics or schismatics, must not be repeated (*Epis.*, xxii., 2), because the convert had received in Baptism "the character of the Lord" (*Epis.*, clxxiii., 23). This character, imprinted and engraved on the one baptized (*Ser. ad Cæs.* 2) cannot be lost; it is like the bodily sign with which soldiers and sheep are marked, or like the image stamped on coins (*Contra Epis. Parmen*, ii., 29). Against the Donatists of his time he likewise appeals to the constant tradition of the Church, which forbade the re-ordination of Bishops validly ordained by unworthy ministers. The priestly character is given by God once and irrevocably, because the priest's action is at all times the action of Christ Himself (*In Joan.*, v., 15; *Contra litt. Petil.*, v.).

St. Thomas defines the sacramental character "as a seal by which the soul is marked, so that it may receive, or bestow on others things pertaining to divine worship; . . . it is specifically the character of Christ, to whose character the faithful are likened . . . a certain participation of Christ's priesthood (*Summa Theol.*, III., Q. 63, art. 3, 4).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: **I. T. April, 1911.**

THE NUMBER OF THE SACRAMENTS

I believe that there are but two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and that your other five Sacraments are a corruption of the Apostolic teaching. How can you prove that there are seven Sacraments?

Do you find seven Sacraments mentioned either in the Bible or in the documents of primitive Christianity? Was not the number seven fixed at a very late date—the twelfth century?

The Reformers, while differing among themselves with regard to the number of the Sacraments, all agreed in rejecting the number seven. Luther, who first accepted three, Baptism, Penance and the Lord's Supper (Grisar, *Luther*, ii., 27), finally agreed with Calvin in reducing the number to two, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Against them the Council of Trent taught that "there are neither more nor less than seven Sacraments" (Sess. vii., can. 1).

The New Testament mentions all the Sacraments more or less explicitly, as we will see in the following pages, but never gives us a list of them. There is nowhere in its pages a sys-

tematic statement of the teachings of Christ, as one might find in a creed, a catechism, or a manual of theology. Christ entrusted to His Church all His seven Sacraments just as He entrusted the Bible to her safe keeping, but while she used daily these means of grace and salvation, she did not at once make an inventory of them.

The early Fathers mentioned, indeed, all of the seven Sacraments, but they never drew up a complete list of them. Most of their references were made with the practical aim of instructing catechumens and the faithful, or of refuting the current heresies. As a rule, they did not write systematic treatises of theology, nor had they come to any agreement regarding the precise meaning of a Sacrament. They had no criterion to distinguish the rites of the Church, which are productive signs of grace (Sacraments), from those which are simply signs (sacramentals).

We however find the Apostolic Fathers, like St. Justin, mentioning frequently Baptism and the Eucharist, to refute the calumnies of the pagans. Tertullian a hundred years later speaks also of Confirmation and Penance. In the third century the baptismal controversy made writers of both East and West discuss the conditions necessary for the validity of Baptism, Confirmation, Orders and the Eucharist. Fourth century writers like St. Cyril wrote treatises on Baptism, Confirmation and the Eucharist for the instruction of the catechumens. The Donatist controversy led St. Augustine to treat of Baptism and Orders, while the Pelagian heresy compelled him to prove that the sanctity of Marriage could be reconciled with the propagation of Original Sin. He mentions six of the seven Sacraments, and the seventh, Extreme Unction, is described by his contemporary, Pope Innocent I (401-417), in his letter to Decentius of Gubbio. By the fifth century, therefore, we meet with all the seven Sacraments, not only among the Catholic Fathers, but also in the writings of the Nestorians and Monophysites, who still accept them all.

The Eastern Orthodox Church has always believed in the seven Sacraments. In 1576, Jeremias, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, refused all offers of union with the Lutherans of Wittenberg, because of their heretical denial of the seven Sacraments. A synod of Constantinople in 1638 anathematized Lukaris of Constantinople for his Lutheran, non-Apostolic teaching of two Sacraments, and declared that seven Sacraments were instituted by Christ. This teaching was confirmed in the synods of Jassy in 1642, and of Jerusalem in 1672.

The seven Sacraments are mentioned by Otto of Bamberg (1127), Bishop Gregory of Bergamo (1133-1146), by Paululus of Amiens (1150), and by Roland, afterwards Pope Alexander

III (1159-1181). Peter Lombard in 1148, did not create a new dogma, as Harnack asserts (*History of Dogma,* vi., 202), but simply formulated the data of tradition more clearly than his predecessors.

The Abbé Broglie says: "After all, the doctrine has been the same during all ages, because all our sacramental rites have always been used with faith in their efficacy. But the systematic and philosophic form has progressed. The proposition that there are seven Sacraments of the New Law, which alone produce grace *ex opere operato,* now a dogma of faith, could not have appeared evident in the eleventh century on account of a lack of precision in language. The Church advances in her knowledge of the truth; she advances slowly and prudently, but yet she does advance; each century adds more precision, more completeness in her knowledge. The condition of this progress is the assistance of the Holy Ghost, directing human thought, and repressing its errors" (*Conferences sur la Vie Surnaturelle,* 307)

Bibliography: Pourrat, *Theology of the Sacraments,* 256-294.

THE DIVINE INSTITUTION OF THE SACRAMENTS

Did not the Catholic Church invent five at least of the seven Sacraments? Were they not borrowed from the rites of paganism? If Christ instituted the Sacraments, why do we find so many different ways of administering them in East and West?

It is of faith that Christ instituted the seven Sacraments (Council of Trent, Sess. vii., *De Sac.,* can. 1). The Church has no power whatever to institute a Sacrament, because the Sacraments produce supernatural grace in the soul. "None but God can cause grace, since grace is nothing else than a participated likeness of the Divine Nature" (2 Peter i. 4; *Summa Theol.,* III., Q. 62, art. 1). God alone therefore can institute a Sacrament (*Ibid.,* Q. 64, art. 2).

The diversity of practice at different times in the Church (Orders), and even to-day in the East and West (Confirmation, Penance) proves that Christ did not prescribe the acts and words (matter and form) to be used in each Sacrament. As the Council of Trent said: "The power has ever been in the Church, that, in the dispensation of the Sacraments, their substance being untouched, it may ordain or change what things soever it may judge most expedient for the profit of those who receive, or for the veneration of the said Sacraments" (Sess. xxi., ch. 2).

The theory of modern unbelievers (Bohling, Heitmuller, Loisy, Reitzenstein) that St. Paul and primitive Christianity borrowed its cult from paganism has been ably refuted by non-Catholic (Anrich, Cumont, Kenedy, Jones, Schweitzer) and Catholic (Lagrange, Jacquier, Mangenot, Prat, Venard) scholars. "All practices suggested by the religious instinct have a certain analogy between them," writes Father Prat, "but it would be an unpardonable fallacy to transform these similitudes into proofs of interdependence" (*Theology of St. Paul,* ii., 386). The detestation of idolatry manifested by the early Christians (Clement of Alexandria, *Cohort ad Gent.*, 2; Tertullian, *De Spectaculis; De Corona; De Idolatria*) negatives the idea of their borrowing anything from their magical, superstitious and immoral cults and mysteries. Indeed, the borrowing must be attributed to the pagan, as we learn from St. Justin (1 *Apol.* 66) and Tertullian (*De Præs.*, 40). The latter writes: "Does not the devil ape in the mysteries of idols the things of Divine faith? He also baptizes his believers, and promises to make their faults disappear by a laver of his own. If I am not mistaken, Mithra signs the forehead of his soldiers, and celebrates the oblation of bread."

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Pourrat, *Theology of the Sacraments,* 295-344; Slater, *Christ and Evolution.* D. A. iii. 964-1014.—R. A. xvi. 176, 241, 339.—R. B. xvi. 419-480; xvii. 420-446.—R. C. lxxiv. 1-258; lxxv. 129.

THE MINISTER OF THE SACRAMENTS

Can anyone administer the Sacraments? Are not all Christians priests?

No, this doctrine of Luther was condemned by the Council of Trent (Sess. vii., can. 10). He, the first anti-clerical, held that all Christians were priests, believing as he did that the Sacraments had no other purpose save to excite the faith of the recipient by recalling the Divine promises. The texts he cited refer to an internal, spiritual priesthood (1 Peter ii. 5) which consists in the offering of a contrite heart (Ps. i. 19), or to a heavenly priesthood (Apoc. i. 6; *Cf.* xx. 6).

To administer the Sacraments validly, Baptism and Matrimony excepted, the minister must be a representative of Jesus Christ, an agent acting in His name. "So let a man think of us as the ministers of Christ" (1 Cor. iv. 1; *Cf.* Acts xx. 28; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 2; Heb. v. 1, 4).

Baptism is an exception, because it is absolutely necessary

for salvation. In case of urgent necessity, a layman can baptize, although its solemn administration calls for one in Holy Orders. As the contract and the Sacrament of Marriage are identical in the Sacrament of Matrimony, the contracting parties are the sole ministers of the sacrament.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Grisar, *Luther*, ii., 31, 89; iv., 455; vi., 203, 311.

THE DOCTRINE OF INTENTION

In view of your doctrine that the administration of a Sacrament depends upon the intention of the minister, how can anyone ever be certain of having received a Sacrament?

The Reformers, who held that the efficacy of the Sacraments depended solely upon the faith of the subject, naturally denied the necessity of any intention upon the part of the minister. The Catholic Church, believing in the objective efficacy of the Sacraments, regards the minister as one who represents Christ and acts in His name. The minister, therefore, must conform his will to the divine will; as a minister of God's Church he must have "at least the intention of doing what the Church does" (Trent. Sess. xiv., can. 9). Such a doctrine is self-evident. How can a priest absolve a penitent, if he does not intend to do so? How can two parties to a marriage give a valid consent, if they have no intention to marry? A right intention is therefore an essential element of the sacramental idea.

To deliberately withhold one's intention would be a sin of such malign malice, that we think it beyond the average sinner's thought. We have a perfect trust in God's general providence, and a perfect confidence in the Church's extreme watchfulness with regard to the administration of the Sacraments, that frees us from all worry in the matter.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Pourrat, *The Theology of the Sacraments*, 345-395; Ryder, *Catholic Controversy*, 213-217; Smith, *The Doctrine of Intention*. C. W. xxxii. 813.

BAPTISM BY NON-CATHOLICS VALID

May a non-Catholic or a sinner validly baptize? What do you think of the custom in some of our city hospitals of agnostic and Jewish doctors baptizing Catholic children? Why do you re-baptize converts to your Church?

Non-Catholics and sinners may validly baptize, for the validity of the Sacrament does not depend upon the personal worthiness or the orthodoxy of the minister (Trent, Sess. vii., can. 12; *De Bapt.*, can. 4). This has been the constant tradition of the Church, as we may learn from the condemnation of St. Cyprian's views by Pope St. Stephen (254-257), and of the Donatists by the Council of Arles in 314.

St. Vincent of Lerins mentions the letter of Pope Stephen: "In an Epistle which he sent to Africa, he (St. Stephen) issued a decree in these words: 'Nothing is to be innovated, but what has been handed down.' What, therefore, was the result of the whole matter? What, indeed, but the usual and accustomed one. Antiquity was retained; novelty exploded" (*Adv. Hær.*, 6).

The custom of the physicians you mention is most praiseworthy. Carefully instructed by either Catholic priests or nurses these non-Catholics validly baptize, for they have the intention of doing what the Catholic Church does.

The conditional Baptism which is given to converts is in no sense a re-Baptism. If the original Baptism was duly performed, the Catholic Baptism is a mere ceremony without effect; if the first Baptism was invalid, as often happens, the Catholic Baptism is the only real one.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: D. A. i. 390-418.—D. T. ii. 219-233.

THE BAPTISM OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

Is there any difference between the baptism of John and Christian Baptism?

The Council of Trent taught that there was an essential difference between the efficacy of the Jewish baptism of John (Matt. xxi. 25; Luke xx. 4; Acts xix. 3) and the Baptism instituted by Christ (Acts ii. 38; viii. 12; x. 48; xix. 5). Christian Baptism remits sin and gives the Holy Ghost (Acts ii. 38; xxii. 16; 1 Cor. vi. 11), while the baptism of John did not, as John himself declared: "I have baptized you with water, but He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost" (Mark i. 8; *Cf.* Acts xi. 16). St. Paul at Ephesus, realizing the inefficacy of John's baptism, gave Christian Baptism to the Jews who had been baptized by John. "They said to him: We have not so much as heard whether there be a Holy Ghost. And he said: In what then were you baptized? Who said: In John's baptism. Then Paul said: John baptized the people with the baptism of penance, saying: That they should believe in Him who was to come after him, that is to say in Jesus. Having heard these things,

they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts xix. 2-5).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: D. A. ii. 792.—D. L. ii. 346.—D. T. viii. 646-655.

THE WASHING OF THE FEET

Why do not Catholics consider the washing of the feet a Sacrament (John xiii. 4-10)?

Because divine tradition has always regarded this custom as a sacramental, not a Sacrament. The Mennonites and Dunkards alone make it a sacrament, falsely interpreting our Lord's words as a command, instead of a counsel. A sacramental does not produce sanctifying grace, but derives its efficacy from the disposition of the recipient.

The practice of washing the feet at Baptism was for many years a custom in Milan, Gaul and Ireland (St. Ambrose, *De Mys.*, vi., 32), and it is mentioned in the Rule of St. Benedict as a practice of humility and charity. The liturgical custom of washing the feet on Maundy Thursday is mentioned in the *Cæremoniale Episcoporum*. It is observed to-day by Bishops, superiors of religious orders, and by the King of Spain.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Thurston, *Lent and Holy Week*. R. C. xii. 157

BAPTISM BY IMMERSION

As a Baptist I hold that immersion is the only true baptism. Was not Christ the Lord baptized by immersion? Does not the word "Baptizein" in the original Greek mean to immerse? Was not immersion the practice of the primitive Christians?

The Catholic Church teaches that Baptism consists in the washing of water with the invocation of the Blessed Trinity (Council of Trent, Sess. vii., *De Bapt.*, can. 2; *Decretum pro-Armenis*).

The Greek word "Baptizein" is used by profane authors to mean the dipping of an object into water, or the washing it by either aspersion or immersion (Kitto, *Bibl. Encycl.*, "Baptism"). In the Scriptures it means bathing or washing (4 Kings v. 14; Judith xii. 7; Ecclus. xxxiv. 30; Mark vii. 3, 4; Luke xi. 38), being overwhelmed with evils (Isa. xxi. 4; Mark x. 33; Luke xii. 50), or the Sacrament of Baptism by which men are spiritually cleansed (John iii. 5; Matt. xxviii. 19; Rom. vi. 3).

No argument can be drawn from our Lord's baptism

by John (Matt. iii. 16), for the sinless Son of God needed no cleansing from sin. John's baptism, although superior to the legal purifications of the Jews (Exod. xxx. 17-21; Lev. vi. 27; Num. xix. 7), was essentially distinct and inferior to the Baptism instituted by Christ (Council of Trent, Sess. vii., *De Bapt.*, can. 1). It was at best an external ceremony of bodily ablution (John i. 31), which, according to John himself, did not confer grace or impart the Holy Spirit (John i. 31; *Cf.* Mark i. 8). As St. Thomas says: "It prepared men for grace, leading men to faith in Christ, and exciting them to sorrow for their sins" (*Summa Theol.*, III., Q. 38, art. 3). That is why St. Paul rebaptized those who had received the baptism of John. They had not received the Holy Ghost (Acts xix. 2-5).

Catholics admit that immersion brings out more fully the meaning of the Sacrament (Rom. vi. 3, 4; Col. ii. 12; Tit. iii. 5; Eph. v. 27), and that for twelve centuries it was the common practice. St. Thomas tells us it was the common practice in the thirteenth century, but he adds: "Baptism can also be conferred by sprinkling and pouring" (*Summa Theol.*, III., Q. 66, art. 7).

The Orthodox always baptize by immersion, and erroneously think it so necessary that they doubt the validity of any other kind of Baptism. They have gone so far as to rebaptize all Latins who joined their Church (1756, Synod of Constantinople; *Cf.* Fortescue, *The Orthodox Eastern Church*, 420).

Against this heretical doctrine the Council of Trent indirectly defined the validity of Baptism by effusion (Sess. vii., *De Bapt.*, can. 3). Divine tradition clearly proves that from the beginning Baptism by sprinkling or pouring was always considered as valid as Baptism by immersion. Tertullian describes Baptism as "a sprinkling with any kind of water" (*De Bapt.*, ch. 6). St. Augustine says that Baptism forgives sins even if the water "merely sprinkles the child ever so slightly" (*In Joan.*, lxxx., 3). The Baptism of invalids, clinical Baptism (from *Kline*, a bed), was given by the pouring of water (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, vi., 43), and a document of the first century, the *Document of the Twelve Apostles*, prescribes effusion when there is not enough water available for immersion (ch. viii.).

The proof from archæology of Baptism by effusion is most convincing. Duchesne writes: "We constantly see representations of the celebration of Baptism on monuments. . . . But do we ever see total immersion, the neophyte plunged into the water so as to disappear completely? Such a thing is NEVER seen. This immersion is never to be met with in the mosaics of ancient churches, in the paintings of the Catacombs, in ordinary pictures, domestic objects, glasses, spoons, etc.; it is never sculptured or engraved on marble. In all such an-

cient monuments the neophyte appears standing, his feet in the water, but the greater part of the body out of the water, while water is poured on his head with the hand or with a vase. This is Baptism by infusion, not by immersion; it is not a bath taken by plunging into deep water or into a tank; it is more like a douche taken over a large vase" (*Churches Separated from Rome,* 62). The early baptisteries in the cemetery of St. Priscilla, in the Coemeterium Ostrianum, and of Pontianus, also bear clear witness to Baptism by effusion (Barnes, *The Early Church in the Light of the Monuments,* 117).

Threefold washing by immersion, effusion or sprinkling has always been the common custom, but it is not essential (Pope Gregory the Great, *Epis.* 43). It is required to-day by the Church, although a single washing would certainly be valid.

It is certainly not probable that the three thousand converts of St. Peter on Pentecost (Acts ii. 41) were baptized by immersion, owing to their great numbers, and to the scarcity of water in Jerusalem (Robertson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine,* 479-516). Immersion again was not practical in the home of Cornelius (Acts x. 47, 48), or in the prison at Philippi (Acts xvi. 33).

The very fact that Baptism is necessary for salvation proves that immersion is not the only method allowed by Jesus Christ. Are men in prison, the sick and dying, children just born, the Esquimaux of the Arctic Circle or the Bedouins of the desert, to die without Baptism, because immersion is practically impossible? A Baptist, who declares Baptism non-essential, may think so; not a Catholic, who holds with Christ, "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God" (John iii. 5).

Bibliography: Labauche, *Baptism, Confirmation.* D. T. ii. 167-178.

Is it sufficient to baptize one in the name of Jesus Christ, as we read in the Scriptures (Acts ii. 38; viii. 12, 16; xix. 2-5)?

No, the form of Baptism was laid down by Christ Himself: "Going therefore teach all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. xxviii. 19). Baptism "in the name of Christ" means Christian Baptism contrasted with the baptism of John (Acts xix. 2-5). These converts were not baptized under the invocation of Christ, but in the faith and by the authority of Christ, by the Baptism He instituted in the name of the Blessed Trinity (Matt. xxviii. 19).

Bibliography: D. T. ii. 172.

THE NECESSITY OF BAPTISM

Does your Church teach that Baptism is absolutely necessary for salvation? Do you therefore put all who die without Baptism in hell? Why condemn pagans who have never heard of Baptism, or children, who through no fault of their own die unbaptized, to eternal damnation?

It is of faith that Baptism is a necessary means of salvation (Council of Trent, Sess. vii., can. 5). The words of Christ are plain: "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John ii. 5). He commanded the Apostles to baptize all nations, and promised salvation to all who believed and were baptized (Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 16).

The Catholic Church does not condemn everyone to hell who has not been baptized with water. She mitigates the apparent harshness of her doctrine by teaching that in case of urgent necessity the Baptism of desire will suffice (Council of Trent, Sess. vi., *De Just.*, cap. iv.; Sess. vii., *De Sac.*, can. 4). This is the doctrine of the Fathers of the Church. St. Ambrose says in his sermon on the Emperor Valentinian II, who died a catechumen: "I hear you express grief that he did not receive the Sacrament of Baptism. Tell me, what else is there in us except the will and petition? But he had long desired to be initiated before he came to Italy, and expressed his intention to be baptized by me as soon as possible. . . . Has he not, therefore, the grace which he desired? Surely he received it because he asked it" (*De Obitu Valent.*, 51). St. Augustine says the same: "I find that not only suffering for the name of Christ can supply the defect of Baptism, but even faith and conversion of heart, if there be no time for celebrating the Sacrament" (*De Bapt.*, iv., 22).

The Baptism of blood, or martyrdom for Christ, was also regarded by the Fathers as an equivalent for Baptism of water, St. Augustine writes: "To all those who die confessing Christ, even though they have not received the laver of regeneration, martyrdom will prove as effective for the remission of sins, as if they were washed at the baptismal font" (*De Civ. Dei.*, xiii., 2).

Adults who die without the knowledge of the Gospel are saved by the merits of Christ, if they die in perfect charity or are perfectly contrite for their sins. This includes the implicit desire of Baptism, which is defined as "a state of mind in which a man would ardently long for Baptism, if he knew that it was necessary for salvation" (Oswald, *Die Lehre von Den Sakramenten*, 211).

Children dying unbaptized are indeed deprived of the Beatific Vision of God in heaven, but they do not incur the punishment of hell, which is due only to actual sin. Their deprivation of heaven is not unjust on God's part, for the glory of heaven is a free, supernatural gift, in no way due to human nature. It is highly probable that they enjoy a natural happiness, as St. Thomas teaches (in IV Sent. II, dist. xxx, Q. 2, ad. 5). "They are free from pain and sorrow, and even enjoy a certain inward peace and happiness, so that they attain at least a minimum of that felicity which would have been their natural end, if human nature had not been elevated to a supernatural order" (Wilhelm-Scannell, *Manual of Theology*, ii., 34).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: D'Alès, *Baptême et Confirmation;* Corblet, *Histoire du Sacrament du Baptême;* Ermoni, *La Baptême dans l'Eglise Primitive;* Murphy, *Baptism.* A. Q. 1885, 502.—D. Jan., 1895.—D. T. ii. 167-378.—D. L. ii. 251-346.—E. March, 1898.—R. B. 1902, 464.

INFANT BAPTISM

Does not the Bible require faith and repentance preparatory to Baptism? How can babies repent and believe (Mark xiv. 16; Acts ii. 38; viii. 12-37; xvi. 14-31)? There is no mention of infant Baptism in the Bible. Did the early Church believe in infant Baptism?

The texts cited are irrelevant, for they simply declare that faith and sorrow for sins committed are required of adult converts seeking admission into the Church. The Catholic Church teaches that same doctrine to-day. There is no express mention of the baptizing of infants in the New Testament, but it is at least probable that there were infants among the whole families that were baptized by St. Paul (Acts xvi. 15; 1 Cor. i. 16). The necessity of infant Baptism follows from the fact that they have contracted the guilt of original sin (Rom. xii. 5-19), which Baptism alone can remit (John iii. 5).

The early Fathers are unanimous in insisting upon infant Baptism, basing it on the universal command of Christ to all (Matt. xxviii. 19; John iii. 5), and on its divine power to cleanse from original sin. St. Irenæus (140-205) writes: "He came to save all who through Him are born again unto God; infants, and children, boys and youths, and elders" (*Adv. Hær.*, Lib. ii., ch. xxii.) Origen (185-255) declares infant Baptism an Apostolic institution (*Epis. ad. Rom.*, Lib., v., 9), and necessary to cleanse infants from their Original Sin (*In Lev.*, viii., 3). St. Cyprian and the Bishops of the Third Council of Carthage (253) taught that children should be baptized as soon as possible after

birth. Their Baptism was not to be deferred until the eighth day, as some maintained. This is (*Epis.*, lix., 3-5), a faithful echo of the teaching of the Apostles, as St. Augustine remarked (*Epis.*, cxliv., 23).

The Council of Milevis (416) taught the necessity of infant Baptism, and this doctrine was repeated in the Councils of Fourth Lateran, Vienne, Florence and Trent.

BAPTISM "FOR THE DEAD"

What is meant by being "baptized for the dead" (1 Cor. xv. 29)?

Many interpretations have been given of this obscure text of St. Paul. It refers to Christians who received Baptism with a view to the resurrection of the dead (St. John Chrysostom; Theodoret); to catechumens who deferred their baptism until the hour of death (St. Epiphanius); to Christians who were baptized over the graves of the martyrs; to a metaphorical Baptism of mortification or affliction for the comfort of the dead; to the practice of vicarious Baptism received by the living for their unbaptized dead relatives or friends (Tertullian). Without approving this practice, the Apostle appealed to it as a proof of the common belief in the resurrection of the dead.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Calmet, *Commentaire Litéræ sur les Livres de l'Ecriture*, viii., 165. D. T. ii. 360-369.—D. L. ii. 379.

SPONSORS

May a Protestant be sponsor for a Catholic child?

No, this is expressly forbidden by canon law (Canon 765). It is the duty of a sponsor or godparent to regard his spiritual children as his perpetual charges, and to instruct them in the obligations of the Christian life, especially when the parents neglect their duty. A conscientious non-Catholic could not fulfill this obligation.

CHRISTIAN NAMES

Are parents bound to give Christian names to their children at Baptism?

They are, according to canon law (Canon 761). When they refuse to do so, the pastor is bound to add a saint's name to the name proposed by the parents, and to record both names in the baptismal register.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Grussi, *Chats on Christian Names.*

CONDITIONAL BAPTISM

Why do you rebaptize Protestants when they enter your Church?

We do not rebaptize them, as Baptism can be received only once, as we saw above (p. 232). We baptize converts conditionally, only when a prudent doubt exists about the validity of the former Baptism. The form is: "If thou art not baptized, I baptize thee," etc. If the first Baptism was valid, the conditional Baptism is not a Sacrament.

THE EFFICACY OF BAPTISM

Is not Baptism a mere external ceremony of initiation into the Christian fellowship?

No, this was a logical inference from the false Reformation doctrines of reputed righteousness and justification by faith alone, which the Council of Trent condemned (Sess. vi., *De Just.*).

The Church teaches that Baptism cleanses from all sins, original and actual (Council of Trent, Sess. v., can. 5). "Do penance and be baptized every one of you . . . for the remission of your sins" (Acts ii. 38). "Rise up and be baptized, and wash away thy sin" (Acts xxii. 16; *Cf.* 1 Cor. vi. 11). "All sins are forgiven in Baptism," says St. Jerome (*Epis.*, lxix., 4).

Baptism remits not only the eternal penalties of sin, but also all temporal punishments, so that "in those who are born again, there is nothing that God hates . . . in them "is nothing whatever to retard their entrance into heaven" (Council of Trent, Sess. v., can. 5; *Cf.* Rom. vi. 4).

Baptism confers sanctifying grace upon the soul, making it "a partaker of the Divine Nature" (2 Peter i. 4), a friend of God (John xv. 14), and an adopted child of God (Rom. viii. 15); it also imparts the three divine virtues of faith, hope and charity (Sess. vi., can. 7), and makes us living temples of the Holy Ghost (John xiv. 16; 1 Cor. iii. 16).

Baptism imprints an indelible character upon the soul, so that it cannot be repeated (Sess. vii., *De Sac.*, can. 9).

Baptism makes us members of Christ's Church, with all a Christian's rights and duties. "As many of you as have been baptized in Christ have put on Christ." "We are all baptized into one Body" (Gal. iii. 27; 1 Cor. xii. 13, 27).

CONFIRMATION

Can you prove from the Bible that Confirmation is a Sacrament distinct from Baptism? What passage proves its institution by Christ? Was not the laying of hands (Acts viii. 17) a conferring of special gifts, like healing, speaking with tongues, etc.?

The institution of Confirmation by Christ is nowhere expressly stated in the New Testament, but Catholics are certain that it is a divinely instituted Sacrament distinct from Baptism by the infallible witness of the Church (Council of Trent, Sess. vii., *De Sac.,* can. 1; *De Conf.,* can. 1).

Christ promised that those who believed in Him would receive the Holy Ghost (John vii. 37-39; John xiv. 16; xv. 26; xvi. 7). The Apostles "were filled with the Holy Ghost" on Pentecost (Acts ii. 4), and both St. John (vii. 38) and St. Peter (Acts ii. 38) declare that this Pentecostal gift was intended for all Christians. The Apostles imparted the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands, a sacramental rite distinct from Baptism, for the Samaritans whom Peter and John confirmed had already been baptized by Philip (Acts viii. 14, 18). St. Paul and St. John make frequent references to Confirmation (2 Cor. i. 21, 22; Eph. i. 13; Tit. iii. 5; 1 John ii. 20, 27). The Apostles would certainly not have confirmed the faithful by a distinct rite after Baptism, unless they had received it from Christ.

St. Jerome speaks of Confirmation being given by the Bishops of his time (*Dial. adv. Lucif.,* 9), and he cites the passage on Confirmation in the Acts of the Apostles, as St. Cyprian had done two hundred years before (*Epis.* 73, *Ad Jubian,* 9; *Cf.* Tertullian, *De Bapt.,* 7).

That the laying on of hands did not mean simply the bestowing of extraordinary gifts, is proved by the fact that these gifts were sometimes given without any external rite (Acts x. 44), and did not always accompany Confirmation (1 Cor. xii. 30).

Bibliography: D. Jan., 1895.—D. A. i. 651.—D. T. ii. 915-1103.

How is the Sacrament of Confirmation given? Is it necessary for salvation? Can a priest ever confer it? What is its effect?

Confirmation is given by the Bishop, and consists in the imposition of hands and the anointing with chrism, a mixture of olive oil and balsam, which is specially blessed by the Bishop on Holy Thursday. The words spoken by the Bishop as he anoints the forehead with chrism are: "I sign thee with the sign

of the cross, and confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

"By Confirmation we receive an increase of grace and are strengthened in the faith" (Council of Florence). It imparts to the soul the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, especially fortitude to profess our faith, and to successfully combat its enemies (St. Ambrose, *De Myst.*, vii., 42).

Confirmation is not necessary for salvation like Baptism, but all Christians are to receive it, if they possibly can. As the Catechism of the Council of Trent says: "It ought not to be omitted by anyone; in a matter so full of holiness through which the divine gifts are so liberally bestowed, the greatest care should be taken to avoid all neglect."

The Bishop is the ordinary minister of this Sacrament, although the Pope has at times granted the power to administer Confirmation to simple priests, *v. g.*, to missionaries in pagan lands, and to the Custodian of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: D'Alès, *Baptême et Confirmation;* Dolger, *Das Sakrament der Firmung.* D. T. ii. 2395-2414; iii. 975-1103.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST

Why do Catholics believe that they receive the living Christ in Communion?

Catholics believe in the Real Presence of Jesus Christ in the Holy Eucharist, because He promised to give His Flesh as food and His Blood as drink (John vi. 48-70); because He fulfilled this promise at the Last Supper (Matt. xxvi. 20; Mark xiv. 22-24; Luke xxii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 23-25); because St. Paul declares this was the belief of the Apostolic Church (1 Cor. x. 16; xi. 27-29); because the early Fathers explicitly taught that the Eucharist was "the flesh and blood of the Incarnate Jesus" (St. Justin, *Apol.*, i., 66); because Christ's infallible Church solemnly defined this doctrine against the Reformers of the sixteenth century. "The Holy Synod teaches . . . that in the august Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and Man, is truly, really and substantially contained under the appearance of those sensible things. . . . If anyone denies that in the Sacrament of the most Holy Eucharist are contained truly, really and substantially the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ; but says that He is therein only as a sign, or a figure or virtually, let him be anathema" (Council of Trent, Sess. xiii., ch. 1, can. 1).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Coupe, *Lectures on the Holy Eucharist;* Dal-

gairns, *Holy Communion;* Durieux, *The Eucharist;* Faber, *The Blessed Sacrament;* Hallett, *The Sacrament of the Eucharist;* Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist;* De Lai, *The Real Presence;* Lattey (ed.), *Catholic Faith in the Eucharist;* Pohle, *The Holy Eucharist;* Pourrat, *The Fathers on the Eucharist;* Rauschen, *Eucharist and Penance;* Vonier, *Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist.* D. A. i. 1548-1585.—D. T. v. 990-1452.

Ought not the sixth chapter of St. John to be interpreted figuratively? Does not the phrase "to eat flesh" signify belief in the divinity of Christ? Why do Catholics take John vi. literally?

Catholics make a distinction between the first part of John vi. (vv. 26 to 51), wherein Christ speaks of Himself figuratively as the Bread of Heaven, a spiritual food to be received by faith, and the second part (vv. 51 to 59), wherein He speaks literally of His Flesh and Blood as a real food, and a real drink. "In the first part," writes Atzberger, the food is of the present, in the second of the future; there it is given by the Father, here by the Redeemer Himself; there it is simply called "bread," here the "Flesh of the Son of Man"; there our Lord speaks only of bread, here of His Flesh and Blood; there, it is true, He calls Himself "bread," but He avoids the expression "to eat Me," where one would expect to meet it; here He speaks both of "eating Me" and of "eating My Flesh and drinking My Blood" (*Handbuch der Kath. Dogmatik,* iv., 569).

A careful study of the whole chapter calls for a literal interpretation of the words "to eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood" (John vi. 54). Christ makes a clear-cut distinction between three kinds of bread: the bread or manna of the desert (Exod. xvi. 15; John vi. 49), given by Moses to the Jews in the past to nourish the body; the Bread of Heaven or the Bread of Life (John vi. 32, 35), Christ Himself, given by the Father in the present to the Jews as an object of faith; and the Bread of Life, Christ Himself in the Eucharist, to be given in the future by Christ for the life of the world (John vi. 52).

Again a figurative interpretation is impossible, according to the rules of language. If a figure of speech has a definite meaning, we cannot use it in a new sense, merely for purposes of controversy.

To eat one's flesh was a familiar figure among the Jews of old, as it is a common figure among the Arabs of to-day, but it always means to do a person some serious injury, especially by calumny or by false accusation. Is it not absurd to imagine that our Lord would promise eternal life and a glorious resurrection to those who calumniated Him?

To drink one's blood was also a familiar figure among the Jews, but it always meant a chastisement of God (Isa. xlix. 26; Apoc. xvi. 6) upon His enemies, a meaning impossible here. Drinking blood was expressly forbidden by the Jewish law (Gen. ix. 4; Lev. iii. 17; vii. 26; xix. 26; Deut. xii. 16; xv. 23), and was therefore regarded as a heinous crime (1 Kings xiv. 33; Judith xi. 10, 11; Ezech. xxxiii. 25). Cardinal Wiseman well says: "The ideas of drinking blood and eating human flesh presented something so frightful to a Jew, that we cannot allow our Savior, if a sincere teacher, to have used them as images for consoling and cheering doctrines; nor in fact to have used them at all under any circumstances than an absolute necessity of recurring to them, as the most literal method of representing His doctrines" (*Lectures on the Real Presence,* 106).

The Jews certainly understood our Lord literally, for they said: "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" (John vi. 53.) Our Lord's reply to them proves that He meant them to do so. We must remember that Christ, like every good teacher, made two sorts of answers to men who objected to His teaching. If they did not understand His meaning, He explained His doctrine more fully. In this way He explains Baptism to Nicodemus (John iii. 3-5), the possibility of the rich man being saved (Matt. xix. 24-26), the fact of Lazarus death (John xi. 11-14), the idea of freedom (John viii. 32-34; *Cf.* John iv. 31-34; viii. 21-23).

When His hearers understood His teaching but refused to accept it, He repeated His teaching with even more emphasis. Thus He insisted upon His power to forgive sins, when the Scribes accused Him of blasphemy (Matt. ix. 2-7), and insisted upon His being Eternal, when the Jews said He was not yet fifty years old (John viii. 56-58).

In like manner He acted with the Jews who objected to His teaching about the Real Presence. When they objected: "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" He did not explain His doctrine in a figurative sense, but He repeated the doctrine that gave offence in a most emphatic manner. He puts His doctrine in the form of a precept: "Except you eat of the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, you shall not have life in you"; and declares "My Flesh is meat indeed, and My Blood is drink indeed." He tells them that this eating and drinking is a pledge of everlasting life, a bond of intimate union with Him, an earnest of supernatural life here and of resurrection hereafter (John vi. 54-59).

When many of the disciples still refused to accept this doctrine, saying: "This saying is hard, and who can hear it (John vi. 61), Christ did not retract His words, and say that He spoke merely in figure. On the contrary He rebuked them for their lac

of faith, and asked them to accept His words, because He came from heaven, and would one day "ascend up where He was before." The unbelieving Jews "walked no more with Him," but the faithful Apostles, who did not comprehend the mystery of the Holy Eucharist, humbly accepted Christ's word. Peter answered for them: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we have believed and have known, that Thou art the Christ, the Son of God" (John vi. 62-70).

The doctrine of the Fathers on the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist may be studied in Berington's *The Faith of Catholics,* ii., 190-374; Batiffol's *Etudes d'Histoire,* ii., 107-383; and Lattey's *Catholic Faith in the Eucharist,* i., 2-72; *D. T.,* v., 1121-1183. They hold that the Body of Christ is really present in the Eucharist; they cite the doctrine of the Real Presence to refute the various heresies of their time on the Incarnation; they expressly deny that the Eucharist is a mere figure of Christ's Body; they assert that Christ is received in Communion, physically and corporeally. St. Ignatius writes: "They (The Docetæ) abstain from the Eucharist and prayer, because they confess not that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Savior Jesus Christ, the flesh which suffered for our sins, which the Father in His mercy raised up" (*Ad Smyrn.,* 7).

St. Justin writes: "We have been taught that the food over which thanksgiving has been made by the prayer of the word which came from Him—by which (food) our blood and flesh are nourished by transmutation—is both Flesh and Blood of that same Incarnate Jesus" (*Apol.,* i., 65, 66).

St. Irenæus writes: "How shall they feel assured that that bread over which thanksgiving has been made is the Body of their Lord, and the chalice of His Blood, if they do not declare Him the Son of the world's Creator?" (*Adv. Hær.,* iv., 18.)

Theophylact writes: "Saying, 'This is My Body,' He showed that the bread sanctified upon the altar is the very Body and not a figure; for He did not say, 'This is a figure,' but, 'This is My Body'" (*In Matt.,* viii., 26).

St. Cyril of Alexandria writes: "Just as a person who joins one piece of wax to another and applies both to the fire, makes the compound of both one, so by means of our participation of the Body of Christ and of His Precious Blood, He is indeed in us, and we are united in Him" (*In Joan.,* x., 4).

Does not Christ plainly indicate that He is speaking figuratively in the sixth chapter of St. John when He says: "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life" (John vi. 63)?

The words flesh and spirit, when opposed to each other in the New Testament, never mean literal and figurative, but always the corrupted dispositions of sinful human nature (flesh) contrasted with human nature enriched by the grace of God (spirit) (Matt. xxvi. 41; Rom. vii. 5, 6, 25; viii. 1-14; 1 Cor. v. 5; 2 Cor. vii. 1; Gal. iii. 3; iv. 29; v. 13-26; 1 Peter iii. 18; iv. 6). Christ's meaning, therefore, is clear: My words are such as the mere carnal man cannot receive, but only the man endowed with grace. St. Chrysostom says: "Why, therefore did He say: The flesh profiteth nothing? Not of His flesh does He mean this. Far from it; but of those who would understand what He said in a carnal sense. . . . You see, there is question not of His flesh, but of the fleshly way of hearing" (*In Joan.*, xlvii., 2).

Ought not the words of Christ at the Last Supper be interpreted in a figurative sense (Matt. xxvi. 26-28; Mark xiv. 22-24; Luke xxii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 23-25)?

The Catholic Church has always interpreted the words: "This is My Body; This is My Blood," which occur in the four accounts of the Last Supper, in a strictly literal sense (Council of Trent, Sess. xiii., cap. 2, 4). No explanation of these simple words can make their meaning clearer. Christ says that what He holds in His hands is His Body and we, like the Apostles, humbly accept His word. The literal sense is the obvious sense, and was in possession from the beginning. The denial of the Sacramentarians came over 1500 years too late, and went counter to the constant voice of Christian tradition. By the year 1577 there were some 200 different interpretations of these words current among the Reformers, which proves how hard pressed they were to defend their arbitrary explanations. Luther till the very end of his life maintained the literal interpretation of these words against the Sacramentarians, Zwingli, Carlstadt, and Œcolampadius, although like all heretics, he illogically waged bitter war against the Sacrifice of the Mass (Grisar, *Luther,* ii., 89, 320; iii., 380, 395, 492-496; iv., 506-518). In fact he said he was tempted to deny the Real Presence in order "to give a great smack in the face of Popery," but the teaching of the Bible and all antiquity were too strong in its favor.

As Pohle well says: "When four independent authors, writing in different countries and at different times, relate the words of institution to different circles of readers, the occurrence of an unusual figure of speech would somehow or other betray itself, either in a difference of word-setting, or in the unequivocal expression of the meaning intended, or at least in the addition of some such remark as: 'He spoke, however, of the sign of His

Body.' . . . In the present case we nowhere discover the slightest ground for a figurative interpretation" (*The Sacraments,* ii., 26).

A figure of speech is always known to us either from the nature of the case, or from the usages of a language. For example, I may refer to a man's cunning by calling him a fox, or to his bravery by calling him a lion. Again I may hold in my hand a photograph of the President of the United States, and say: "This is Mr. Hoover." In both instances my meaning will be evident at once. But in no way is bread the fitting or possible symbol of the human body. Christ plainly excluded any possibility of a figurative meaning to His words when He said: "The Bread that I will give is My Flesh for the life of the world" (John vi. 52). St. Luke's account tells us that Christ spoke of His Body as "given for you," and of His Blood as "shed for you" (Luke xxii. 19, 20). Therefore the Body given to the Apostles was the same Body that was crucified on the Cross, and the chalice contained the same Blood that was shed for our sins.

The words of the institution were spoken on the night preceding our Lord's Passion and Death. The Holy Eucharist was His last Will and Testament (Luke xxii. 20). It was a Sacrament and a Sacrifice to be celebrated in His Church until the end of time (1 Cor. xi. 26). The words of a will should be clear, and interpreted in their natural, literal sense (Gen. xlix. 29; 3 Kings ii. 2; Tob. iv. 3; 1 Mach. ii. 49). Would Christ, the Infinite God and Lover of souls, use a figure of speech that would deceive millions of His followers for all time, and lead them into the very idolatry He came to abolish? The sacraments and sacrifices of the Old Law were established in plain terms. Why not then the more important Sacrament and Sacrifice of the New Law, which Christ was leaving us as a pledge of our supernatural life here and hereafter (John vi. 58, 59).

St. Paul certainly interpreted the words of the institution literally. He writes: "The Chalice of Blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? And the Bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the Body of the Lord?" (1 Cor. x. 16.) He is contrasting the Jewish and the pagan sacrifices with the Sacrifice of the Christians, and arguing against any participation in the pagan sacrificial banquets. The reason given is that partaking of the Consecrated Chalice unites us to the Blood of Christ, and partaking of the Consecrated Bread unites us to the Body of Christ. If the pagan banquet and sacrifice are real, so are the Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice.

He states the doctrine of the Real Presence even more plainly in 1 Cor. xi. 27-29. He writes: "Therefore, whosoever shall eat this Bread and drink the Chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be

guilty of the Body and of the Blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that Bread and drink of the Chalice. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the Body of the Lord."

"Plain and simple reason," says Cardinal Wiseman, "seems to tell us that the presence of Christ's Body is necessary for an offence committed against it. A man cannot be 'guilty of majesty,' unless the majesty exists in the object against which his crime is committed. In like manner, an offender against the Blessed Eucharist cannot be described as guilty of Christ's Body and Blood, if these be not in the Sacrament" (*Lectures on the Real Presence*, 319).

If our Lord is not present in Communion, these words of the Apostle are utterly meaningless. Because Christ is really present, the Apostle warns the sinner to cleanse his conscience of sin, for an unworthy Communion merits God's condemnation or judgment. We must distinguish this Body of the Lord from all other food, and therefore come to Communion with a conscience clear of grievous sin.

Does not the verb "to be" often mean "to represent" in the Scriptures? Are not the following texts parallel to the words—"This is My Body; This is My Blood" (Matt. xxvi. 26-28), *viz.*, "The seven kine are seven years" (Gen. xli. 26); "The ten horns . . . are ten kings" (Dan. vii. 24); "The field is the world" (Matt. xiii. 38); "That rock was Christ" (1 Cor. x. 4); "These are the two covenants" (Gal. iv. 24); "The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches" (Rev. i. 20)?

These texts are parallel to one another, but not to the words of the institution. In every instance there is an explanation of some symbol, such as the interpretation of a dream (Gen. xli. 25), a vision (Dan. vii. 15), a parable (Matt. xiii. 36), a symbol or mystery (Rev. i. 20), an allegory (1 Cor. x. 4; Gal. iv. 24). They are not even grammatically parallel, because with one exception they all have for their subject a noun, whereas the words of the institution have as their subject a demonstrative adverb. In Gal. iv. 24 the pronoun "these" evidently refers to Sara and Agar, mentioned in the previous verse. Moreover St. Paul expressly states: "Which things are an allegory."

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Wiseman, *Lectures on the Real Presence*, 206-222.

Is it not a fact that the Aramaic tongue which Christ spoke had no word meaning "to signify"?

It is not a fact. Cardinal Wiseman over seventy-five years ago proved conclusively that the Syriac language possessed at least forty expressions which meant "to signify" (*Horæ Syriacæ*, 3-73).

Did not Christ say of Himself figuratively "I am the Door" (John x. 9), "I am the true Vine" (John xv. 1)? Might He not, therefore, call the Eucharist His Body only in figure?

"I am the Door" (or Vine) does not mean I represent, or am the figure of the door (or vine), for our Lord certainly did not intend to make Himself the symbol or figure of material objects. The context in both cases makes our Lord's figurative meaning clear. Just as one enters a house through a door, so we have access to the Father through Him. "By Me, if any man enter in, he shall be saved" (John x. 9). Just "as a branch cannot bear fruit of itself, unless it abide in the vine, so neither can you, unless you abide in Me" (John xv. 4).

Does not "to be" mean "to represent" in the passage: "It is the Lord's passover" (Exod. xii. 11)? and in the passage: "This is my covenant which ye shall keep, between Me and you" (Gen. xvii. 10)?

It does not. There is no parallelism, real or verbal, between these two passages and the words of institution. The entire rite described in Exodus xii., and not the paschal lamb, is the Feast of the Passover. The rite of circumcision described in Genesis xvii. is the object of the divine command, not merely a sign or symbol thereof.

Is not the doctrine of the Real Presence impossible? How can the Eternal God be contained in the wafer Catholics receive in Communion.

The doctrine of the Real Presence is undoubtedly a great mystery like the Creation, the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation, but it is not impossible, because it does not imply any self-contradiction. If God can create the universe out of nothing, why cannot He change the substance of bread and wine into His Body and Blood? The true follower of Christ does not ask how can this man give us His Flesh to eat with the unbelieving Jew (John vi. 53), but accepts Christ's word humbly as the Apostles did (John vi. 69, 70). The Apostles who had witnessed the transubstantiation of water into wine at Cana in Galilee (John ii. 1-11), and the feeding of the five thousand with five barley loaves and fishes (John vi. 1-14) never questioned

Christ's power to change bread and wine into His Flesh and Blood.

Non-Catholics declare the doctrine of the Real Presence impossible, because they think it involves a self-contradiction. They suppose that it requires the same thing to be both bread and not bread at the same time. This is not the Catholic teaching. After Consecration the species of bread is not really bread, but the Body of Christ, for the substance of the bread has been changed into the substance of Christ's Body. What is not changed is the "accidents or the sensible qualities of the bread; *viz.*, its color, taste," etc. But the reality of a thing lies in its substance, the invisible part of it, not in the accidents, or visible part. St. Cyril stated this clearly: "Being fully persuaded that what seems bread is not bread, even though it seems so to the taste, but Christ's Body; and what seems wine is not wine, even though the taste will have it so, but Christ's Blood" (*Cat.*, iv., 9).

The substance of Christ's Body in the Eucharist has none of the sensible qualities of a human body; it is not extended so as to occupy space, although it is united with accidents which do occupy space. Contrary to physical laws, as the Catechism of the Council of Trent says, "they subsist of themselves, inhering in no subject." It would, therefore, be wrong to say: "The Body of Christ is round" or "The Blood of Christ has a light color," for these expressions are to be used with regard to the accidents alone. This is certainly a mysterious doctrine, hard to understand, because there is nothing like it in all our experience. But the mysteries of Christianity are all unique, because they pertain to divine things. We accept them on the testimony of God (1 John v. 9), and on the infallible witness of Christ's divine Church.

Was not your doctrine of transubstantiation invented by the Council of Trent? Can it be proved from the Bible or from the teaching of the primitive Church?

The word "transubstantiation" is not older than the eleventh century, but the idea is clearly taught in the Bible and in the early Fathers. The Council of Trent thus defines the way in which Christ is really present in the Holy Eucharist: "By the Consecration of the bread and of the wine a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the Body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His Blood; which conversion is by the Holy Catholic Church suitably and properly called transubstantiation" (Sess. xiii., cap. 4; *Cf.* Council of Lateran in 1215; Second Council of Lyons, 1274).

By this definition the Council condemned the Lutheran doc-

trine of consubstantiation, that the substance of bread and the Body of Christ exist together (Grisar, *Luther*, i., 162; i., 320; iii., 380; v., 463); the Calvinistic doctrine of a virtual or dynamic presence, whereby the efficacy of Christ's Body and Blood is communicated from heaven to the souls of the Predestined (*Instit.*, iv., 27), and the Zwinglian idea of a mere memorial supper (*Opera*, iii., 240).

The words of institution, "This is My Body," plainly imply that what Christ held in His hands must have ceased to be bread, and must have become His Body. As there was no change in the accidents or appearances of bread and wine, the change must have been what the Church fittingly calls transubstantiation.

St. Ambrose teaches transubstantiation when he asks: "Cannot, therefore, the words of Christ, who was able to make something out of nothing, change that which already exists into something which it was not before? . . . What we effect (by Consecration) is the Body taken from the Virgin" (*De Myst.*, ix., 51).

St. Augustine writes: "That which is seen on the table of the Lord is bread and wine; but this bread and this wine, when the word is added, becomes the Body and Blood of the Logos" (Ser. 5).

St. Cyril writes: "As a life-giving Sacrament we possess the sacred Flesh of Christ and His Precious Blood under the appearances of bread and wine" (*In Luc*, xxii., 19). "What seems to be bread is not bread, but Christ's Body; what seems to be wine is not wine, but Christ's Blood" (*Cath.*, iv. 9).

All the ancient liturgies, Eastern and Western, plainly teach transubstantiation. The following prayer is from the liturgy of St. Basil: "Make this bread into the precious Body of our Lord and God and Redeemer Jesus Christ, and this chalice into the Blood of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ, which was shed for the life of the world" (Pohle, *The Sacraments*, ii., 122).

Is the Eucharist necessary for salvation? How often are Catholics bound to receive Communion?

The Holy Eucharist is not absolutely necessary for salvation, as the Council of Trent defined, when it spoke of the custom of the Church from the third to the eleventh century of giving Communion to children immediately after Baptism and Confirmation (Sess. xxi., cap. 4) It is necessary in the sense that we are commanded by our Lord to receive it (John vi. 54; Luke xxii. 19), and this divine command (Sess. xii., cap. 2) is enforced by the Church law of annual Communion during Easter

time, prescribed by the Fourth Council of Lateran in 1215 Sess. xiii., can. 9).

The early Christians received Communion daily (Acts ii. 42) and the Church has always urged frequent and even daily Communion upon the faithful (Sess. xxii., cap. 6). A decree of Pope Piux X in 1905 declared that "frequent and daily Communion, so earnestly desired by Christ and by the Church, should be open to all the faithful, and that no one ought to be denied it who is in the state of grace, and approaches the Holy Table with a right and devout intention." The same Pope in 1910 condemned the practice of postponing the Communion of children to the tenth, twelfth and fourteenth year, and ordered that they receive It as soon as they are able "to distinguish Eucharistic bread from common and material bread." Nothing more is required save a "certain knowledge of the rudiments of faith."

Bibliography: Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist*, 129; Slater, *Points of Church Law*, 48; De Zulueta, *Early First Communion*. A. Q. 1883, 59.—C. W. xcii. 633.—D. T. ii. 480-574.—E. July, 1906.—I. T. Feb., March, 1910.—R. C. lviii. 417.

What are the effects of Communion in the soul?

The chief effect of Communion is the spiritual union of the soul with Christ by love (John vi. 57, 58). This union with Christ makes His followers united in the bond of charity, which is called the "Mystical Body of Christ." "For we, being many, are one bread, all that partake of One Bread" (1 Cor. x. 17).

The Holy Eucharist increases sanctifying grace in the soul. "No one conscious of mortal sin, how contrite soever he may seem to himself, ought to approach the sacred Eucharist without previous Sacramental Confession," says the Council of Trent (Sess. xiii., cap. 7, can. 11). The Eucharist is a Sacrament of the living—the food and drink of our souls—and, therefore, presupposes that the recipient should be spiritually alive in order to receive it worthily.

The Holy Eucharist is not only a food, but "an antidote, whereby we may be freed from daily faults and preserved from mortal sins" (Sess. xiii., cap. 2).

The Holy Eucharist is finally "a pledge of our glory to come and everlasting happiness" (Sess. xiii., cap. 2; *Cf.* John vi. 55).

Does not the doctrine of the Real Presence contradict the evidence of my senses? What I see and taste is merely bread and wine.

It does not, for what we see and taste after the Consecration are the accidents or appearances of bread and wine, which have not been changed. The senses tell us nothing regarding the

substance of bread and wine before Consecration; they tell us nothing of the Body and Blood of Christ which is present after Consecration.

The senses judge only of appearances, and, therefore, may often lead us to make false inferences. I apparently see the sun rising in the East and setting in the West, but science with its Copernican system of astronomy corrects that mistake. The unbelieving Jew saw in Christ only the man, the carpenter's son (Matt. xiii. 55), but the miracles Jesus wrought should have taught him the fact of Christ's divinity.

Reason and revelation are our guides to divine truth; not feeling or sense impressions. If Christ declared that He would give us His Flesh to eat and His Blood to drink, we must accept His word, no matter how mysterious or incomprehensible the doctrine appears to be.

How can the Body of Christ be in so many places at once? How can Christ be in heaven, and at the same time in all the churches of the world?

The Council of Trent has defined against the Reformers this multilocation of the Body of Christ. "For neither are these things mutually repugnant,—that our Savior Himself always sits at the right hand of the Father in heaven, according to the natural mode of existing, and that, nevertheless, He is in many other places, sacramentally present to us in His own substance, by a manner of existing which, though we can scarcely express it in words, yet by the understanding, illuminated by faith, we can conceive, and ought most firmly to believe, is possible to God" (Sess. xiii., cap. 1).

Father Dalgairns thus answers this question: "The whole question resolves itself into this—can a body be unextended? Who will say that God cannot take from a body the property of extension? What contradiction is there in it? Is it not easy for us to conceive substance without extension? If we take to pieces the idea of substance, we shall find that it is quite independent of quantity, on which extension depends; for the smallest grain of gold is as really and substantially gold, as all the precious metal contained in the whole universe. Again, quantity is a sensible thing which is seen by the eye and felt by the touch; but as for substance, it is revealed to us by the mind alone. Let God but only reduce a body to the state of pure substance, and it ceases at once to be extended, without ceasing to be a body. It is by extension that a body becomes subject to the laws of space; take extension away, and it partakes at once of some of the prerogatives of spirit.

"This then is what God has done to the Body of Jesus in

the Blessed Sacrament. It has ceased to be extended, and all at once it is freed from the fetters which bound it to place. It is not so much that it is in many places at once, as that it is no longer under the ordinary laws of space at all. It pervades the Host like a spirit. It uses, indeed, the locality formerly occupied by the bread, in order to fix itself in a definite place, but it only comes into the domain of space at all indirectly through the species, as the soul only enters into its present relations with space through the body. Who will say that this involves contradiction, or that it is beyond the power of Omnipotence?" (*The Holy Communion,* i., 35, 36.)

COMMUNION UNDER ONE KIND

Why do you go counter to the Bible (John vi. 54; 1 Cor. xi. 27, 29) and the institution of Christ (Matt. xxvi. 27), by denying the cup to the laity in Communion? Did not Christ plainly say: "Drink ye all of this"? Does not the Catholic Church deprive the people of half the Lord's Supper contrary to the practice of the primitive Church?

The Catholic Church, in prescribing Communion under one kind at the Councils of Constance and of Trent, did not in any way go counter to the teaching of Christ or St. Paul, or in any way destroy the essence of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist. The Council of Trent teaches: "Laymen, and clerics when not celebrating, are not obliged by any divine precept to receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist under both kinds, neither can it by any means be doubted, without injury to faith, that Communion under either kind is sufficient for them unto salvation" (Sess. xxi., ch. 1).

It is easy to understand how Protestants who do not believe in the real objective presence of Christ in the Blessed Eucharist, and who do believe that the essence of the Sacrament consists in eating mere bread and drinking mere wine, should insist on receiving under both kinds. Catholics, however, who believe that the Eucharist is the living Jesus Christ, are certain that they receive not His Body alone under the form of bread, nor His Blood alone under the form of wine, but His Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity under either form (Sess. xiii., can. 3). The communicant, who receives under both kinds, receives the same living Christ as he who communicates under one kind only.

The sixth chapter of St. John presents no difficulty, for as the Council of Trent pointed out, the Lord promised the same

reward for Communion under one kind as under both. "He who said: 'Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood, you shall not have life in you' (John vi. 54), also said: 'He that eateth this Bread shall live forever' (John v. 59); and He who said: 'He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood shall have everlasting life' (John v. 55), also said: 'The Bread that I will give is My flesh for the life of the world' (John v. 52); and finally, He who said: 'He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood, abideth in Me and I in him' (John v. 57), said nevertheless: 'He that eateth this Bread shall live forever' " (John v. 59; Sess. xxi., cap. 1).

When Christ said to the Apostles: "Drink ye all of it" (Matt. xxvi. 27), He was speaking not to the laity, but to priests, who in celebrating Mass, as He ordered, always partake of Communion under both kinds. The Eucharist is both a Sacrament and a Sacrifice. For the Sacrifice of the Mass a double Consecration is necessary, for it commemorates the Sacrifice of the Cross. Its Priest is the Priest of Calvary, its Victim is the Victim of Calvary, and its mode of offering is a mystic representation of the blood-shedding of Calvary. Protestants, having abolished the Mass, naturally do not understand the Catholic doctrine of Communion.

St. Paul in his letter to the Corinthians is insisting primarily upon the necessity of the Christian receiving Communion with a heart cleansed of sin. He merely mentions the fact that the early Christians usually received under both kinds, which nobody denies. He says expressly that it is sacrilegious to receive Communion under either form, if one is in mortal sin: "Whosoever shall eat OR DRINK the chalice of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the Body AND the Blood of the Lord" (1 Cor. xi. 27). The reading *OR DRINK* has such overwhelming evidence in its favor, that the Revised Version has corrected the erroneous *AND DRINK* of the King James version.

Our Lord did not prescribe any special mode of Communion any more than He prescribed any special mode of Baptism. The Council of Trent taught that, whereas all the Sacraments were instituted by Christ, He did not prescribe all the acts and words to be used in each Sacrament, as we learn from the Sacrament of Orders. "This power has been in the Church, that, in the dispensation of the Sacraments, their substance being untouched, it may ordain or change what things soever it may judge most expedient for the profit of those who receive, or for the veneration of the said Sacraments" (Sess. xxi., ch. 3).

While therefore Communion under both kinds was the common custom for twelve centuries—it is still so in the East—the Church always approved the concurrent custom of receiving the Holy Eucharist under either kind. St. Cyprian, for example,

speaks of infant Communion under the form of wine in his *De Lapsis,* ch. 25. Communion under the form of bread was far more common. Both Tertullian (*Ad Uxorem,* i., 5) and St. Basil (*Epis.* xciii.) tell us that the early Christians took Holy Eucharist under the form of bread to their homes, and gave themselves Communion before breakfast. From the third to the ninth centuries the anchorites of the desert, when no priest lived among them to say Mass, gave themselves Communion under the form of bread (*Historica Lausiaca,* ix., 52; Rufinus, *Hist. Mon.,* ii., 7; Theodore Stud., *Epis.,* i., 57). St. Dionysius of Alexandria, quoted by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.,* vi., 44) speaks of a child bringing the reserved Host to the dying Serapion. St. Ambrose and St. Basil both received the Holy Eucharist on their death beds, as Catholic Bishops receive it to-day, under the form of bread. The Mass of the Pre-sanctified, which, as its name implies, is not really a Mass, but a Communion, the Hosts being consecrated the day before, is another strong witness of the Church's teaching. It is celebrated on Good Friday in the West, and on every day in Lent in the East, with the exception of Saturdays, Sundays and the Feast of the Annunciation.

The present law of receiving Communion under the form of bread dates from the Council of Constance in 1414, which condemned the Hussites of Bohemia for teaching that the cup was absolutely necessary. This law was confirmed by the Council of Trent (Sess. xxi., ch. 1), which condemned the false teaching of the Reformers on this point. Long before the law was passed, however, the custom of receiving Communion under the form of bread had become widespread for practical reasons. These "grave and just reasons," mentioned by the Council of Trent, were: The risk of spilling the Precious Blood; the difficulty of reserving Communion under the species of wine; the dread of drinking from a chalice touched by infected lips; the cost of obtaining wine for thousands of communicants.

Were any doctrine involved, no difficulty would have prevented the Church from insisting upon the observance of a divine law. As it involved merely a question of discipline, she was ever ready, as the guardian of the Sacraments, to adapt her laws for their administration to the changing conditions of the times.

Insistence upon the necessity of Communion under both kinds is due to erroneous belief regarding the Real Presence, just as insistence upon Baptism by immersion goes hand in hand with the denial of the necessity of Baptism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Fortescue, *The Orthodox Eastern Church,* 477; Smith, *Communion Under One Kind.* D. T. iii. 552-572.

Why do Catholics fast before receiving Communion?

Catholics do not eat or drink anything after midnight, before they receive Communion, out of reverence to our Lord, for as St. Augustine said: "It has pleased the Holy Spirit that, in honor of so great a Sacrament, the Body of the Lord should pass Christian lips before other food; for this reason that custom is observed throughout the whole world" (*Epis.*, cxviii., 6); Tertullian mentions fasting Communion about the year 200 (*Ad Uxorem,* ii., 5). The Third Council of Carthage in 397 passed a decree ordering fasting Communion, allowing but one exception on Maundy Thursday, when Mass was celebrated in the evening, in honor of the Institution of the Eucharist. The Second Council of Braga in 572 ordered priests deposed who said Mass without fasting.

The present law (Canon 852) requires Catholics to be fasting from midnight, unless they are in danger of death, or must receive Communion to prevent irreverence towards the Blessed Sacrament, as might happen were a church on fire, or in danger of profanation. Pius X, on December 7, 1906, exempted from this obligation Catholics sick abed for a month without hope of recovery. They are permitted to receive Communion once or twice a week, as their confessor advises.

Bibliography: Thurston, *The Eucharistic Fast.* R. C. xxi. 301.

Why do Catholics bend the knee before they enter their seat in church?

Genuflection, or bending the knee, is a natural sign of adoration or reverence (Luke xxii. 41; Acts ix. 40; Phil. ii. 10). Catholics genuflect before the tabernacle, where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved, as a mark of adoration to Jesus Christ, who is really present on the altar.

Bibliography: R. C. lvi. 150.

What is meant by Benediction?

Benediction is a devotion, which consists of the singing of hymns of adoration before the Blessed Sacrament, exposed upon the high altar. The priest puts incense in the thurible, and waves it three times in the direction of the Blessed Sacrament, as a symbol of the people's prayer (Ps. cxl. 2). The hymns usually sung are the "O Salutaris Hostia" and the "Tantum Ergo," both composed by St. Thomas Aquinas. At the end, the priest covers his shoulders with a long white silk scarf, called the humeral veil, takes the monstrance in his hands, and makes the sign of the cross (the Benediction) over the kneeling people. The devotion closes with the singing of Psalm cxvi., or the hymn "Holy God, we praise Thy name."

The idea of exposing the Blessed Sacrament in a monstrance was common from the beginning of the fourteenth century, while the chanting of the Litany of Loreto and other hymns in honor of our Lady can be traced to the devotional guilds of thirteenth century Italy.

Bibliography: C. E. ii. 465. R. C. xxix. 259.

What is meant by the Forty Hours' Devotion?

It is a devotion in honor of the Holy Eucharist, the people praying in adoration before It for forty hours continuously, in memory of the forty hours Christ's body remained in the tomb. It begins and ends with a Solemn High Mass, accompanied by a procession of the Blessed Sacrament, and the chanting of the Litany of the Saints.

It originated in Milan at the beginning of the sixteenth century, and its purpose, according to Pope Paul III (1534-1539), was "to appease the anger of God provoked by the offences of Christians, and to bring to naught the machinations of the Turks, who are pressing forward for the destruction of Christendom." It was popularized in Rome by St. Philip Neri and St. Ignatius, who urged its observance as an act of reparation for the sins committed during the carnival. It was introduced into the United States by Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis in 1854.

Bibliography: McKee, *The Forty Hours;* Thurston, *Lent and Holy Week.* C. E. vi. 151-153.

THE MASS

What do Catholics mean by the Mass?

When the Reformers in England and on the continent denied the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Council of Trent thus declared the Church's teaching (Sess. xxii., chs. 1-3; canons 1-5):

1. There is in the Catholic Church a true Sacrifice, the Mass, instituted by Jesus Christ,—the Sacrifice of His Body and Blood under the appearances of bread and wine.

2. This Sacrifice is identical with the Sacrifice of the Cross, inasmuch as Jesus Christ is Priest and Victim in both; the only difference lies in the manner of offering, which is bloody upon the Cross and bloodless on our altars.

3. It is a propitiatory Sacrifice, atoning for our sins, and the sins of the living and of the dead in Christ, for whom it is offered.

4. Its efficacy is derived from the Sacrifice of the Cross, whose infinite merits it applies to us.

5. Although offered to God alone, it may be celebrated in honor and memory of the saints.

6. The Mass was instituted at the Last Supper when Christ, about to offer Himself on the altar of the Cross by His death (Heb. xi. 5) for our redemption (Heb. ix. 12), wished to endow His Church with a visible Sacrifice, commemorative of His Bloody Sacrifice of the Cross. As High Priest, according to the order of Melchisedech (Ps. cix. 9), He offered to His Father His own Body and Blood under the appearances of bread and wine, and constituted His Apostles priests of the New Testament to renew this same offering until He came again (1 Cor. xi. 26) by the words, "Do this in commemoration of Me" (Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 34).

I cannot understand how the Mass can be a true Sacrifice. How can the glorified Jesus be regarded as a Victim?

The Church has never defined in what manner Christ is a Victim in the Mass, but has left this question to the speculations of her theologians. Some make Him a true Victim by endowing Him with new conditions, either of a physical or a moral order, so as to lower His status, or to lessen His activities (De Lugo, Franzelin). Others hold that the mere symbol of immolation, coupled with His Real Presence, is a Sacrifice, because it recalls the bloodstained immolation of Calvary (Vasquez), or because it shows Christ under the appearance of death (Billot). A third school maintains that the Mass implies a virtual slaying of Christ, the words of Consecration having the power to separate the Body and Blood, were it not for the fact that Christ's Body is now glorified (Lessius, Billuart). A fourth school, which seems to have been the traditional view up to the time of the Council of Trent, is thus stated by its ablest defender, the Jesuit, Maurice de la Taille: "The Mass is a Sacrifice and a true Sacrifice, in so far as, by means of a symbolic immolation, it is a true and actual oblation of a true Victim, although it contains no real immolation of Christ actually performed by us, but only a symbolic one, coupled with that state of Victim, perennial and celestial, due to the one real and bloody immolation undergone by Christ in days gone by. The Mass is a Sacrifice, because it is our oblation of the Victim once immolated, even as the Supper was the oblation of the Victim to be immolated" (*The Last Supper and Calvary*, 8).

This was the doctrine set forth in the Catechism of St. Peter Canisius, the great Jesuit controversialist in the days of the Counter Reformation: "The Sacrifice of the Mass rightly understood is both a *representation*, at once holy and living, and *an*

offering, unbloody yet actual of the Passion of the Lord and of the Bloody Sacrifice which was offered for us on the Cross.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: D'Arcy, *The Mass and the Redemption;* Brosnan, *The Sacrifice of the New Law;* Clarke, *The Handbook of the Divine Liturgy;* Dunney, *The Mass;* Fortescue, *The Mass;* Gavin, *The Sacrifice of the Mass;* Gihr, *The Sacrifice of the Mass;* Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist;* Lepin, *Idée du Sacrifice de la Messe;* Lucas, *Holy Mass;* Macdonald, *The Sacrifice of the Mass; It is the Mass That Matters;* Maranget, *The Roman Mass;* Scott, *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass;* Semeria, *The Eucharistic Liturgy;* Sicard, *The Mass;* De la Taille, *Mysterium Fidei; The Last Supper and Calvary;* Veritas, *The Mass and the Church of England;* Woodlock, *The Reformation and the Eucharist.* D. T. x. 1317-1403.

Where do you find the Mass in the Bible? or in primitive Christianity? Is it not really a product of medieval thought?

Malachias, the last of the Prophets, foretold the abolition of the Mosaic sacrifices, and the establishing of a new Sacrifice, which was to be offered up everywhere. The words used by the prophet—*muctar, muggas, mincha*—are used over three hundred times in the Old Testament in the sense of a real sacrifice; they are never used to mean a mere internal worship of praise and thanksgiving. He says: "I have no pleasure in you (the priests), saith the Lord of Hosts, and I will not receive a gift of your hand. For from the rising of the sun even to the going down, My name is great among the Gentiles and in every place there is Sacrifice, and there is offered to My name a clean oblation; for My name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts" (Mal. i. 10, 11).

The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (100) held that the Mass was the Sacrifice foretold by Malachias (ch. xiv.), thus anticipating the Council of Trent by fourteen centuries (Sess. xxii., ch. 1).

The sacrificial character of the Mass is proved from Christ's words in consecrating the chalice. St. Luke's words: "This is the chalice, the New Testament in My Blood, which is shed for you" clearly mean that the Blood contained in the chalice is shed at the present time for you (Luke xxii. 20). St. Matthew: "This is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many unto remission of sins" (xxvi. 28) and St. Mark: "This is My Blood of the New Testament which is shed for many" (xiv. 24), also declare that Christ's Blood is being shed for us. The shedding of blood for remission of sins is a real sacrifice. "For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement: for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life" (Lev. xvii. 11).

The consecration of the bread affords another proof of the sacrificial character of the Mass. The words, "This is My Body, which is given for you" (Luke xxii. 19), or "which is delivered for you" (1 Cor. xi. 24), clearly show that Christ offered Himself up to death.

When the priest at Mass to-day consecrates the Body and Blood of Christ, he offers up to God the Victim of the Passion St. Cyprian in the third century wrote: "The Passion of the Lord is the Sacrifice we offer" (*Epis.*, lxiii., 17). At Mass the priest does what Christ did at the Last Supper. "Do this for the commemoration of Me" (1 Cor. xi. 24). When Christ consecrated the bread and wine into His Body and Blood He offered up His death, so that the priest, consecrating at Mass, also offers up Christ's death.

" 'This is My Body,' He says, 'which is delivered up for you,' —delivered unto death. 'This is My Blood, which is shed for you,' in atonement for your sins. 'My Blood which flows for you': is that not death? Death indeed put before us in a symbol, by means of that sacramental parting of the Blood from the Body; but death at the same time pledged to God for all its worth, as well as all its awful reality, by the expressive language of that sacred symbol. The price of our sins shall be paid on Calvary; but here the liability is incurred by our Redeemer, and subscribed in His very Blood. The Flesh of the Lamb is consigned in God's hands, for as much as it is assigned as our ransom, Christ is bound for His Passion, from which it is henceforth impossible for Him to step back without taking from God what He has given to God, and thus violating that principle of justice, according to which everyone is bound to render unto God the things that are God's" (*Catholic Faith in the Eucharist*, 117).

The whole argument of St. Paul in 1 Cor. x. 16-21, supposes that the Christians have a Sacrifice of their own, which is far superior to the Pagan and Jewish sacrifices, for it enables the Christian to partake of the Body and Blood of the Lord.

"Why partake of the table (altar) of devils," He asks them, "when you can be partakers of the table (altar) of the Lord?" It is a grievous sin of idolatry to share in the sacrificial banquets of the pagans, for this eating and drinking unites you with the altar, the sacrificing priest, and the victim slain. The chalice of benediction and the bread which we break unites us with the Blood of Christ, and makes us partakers of His Body—by Communion we are united to the altar, the sacrificing priest and the Victim slain. Unless there was at Corinth a Christian Sacrifice of the Mass, the comparison of the Apostle would be utterly meaningless.

The Teaching of the Twelve mentions the Eucharistic Sacrifice: "Having assembled together on the Lord's day, break bread

and give thanks, having confessed your sins beforehand in order that your Sacrifice may be pure" (xiv.).

St. Justin Martyr (160) identifies the Eucharist with the "clean oblation," the *mincha* of Malachias, a term which generally suggested the idea of a strict wheat offering. He also speaks of the Eucharist as fulfilling the type of the flour-offering presented by a leper (Lev. xiv.). "The oblation of the flour, which was commanded to be offered up for those cleansed from leprosy was a type of the Bread of the Eucharist, which Jesus Christ commanded us to celebrate. . . . Concerning those Sacrifices which are offered to Him in every place by us Gentiles, that is, the Bread of the Eucharist, and similarly the Cup of the Eucharist" (*Dial. Cum. Tryph.*, 41).

St. Irenæus (140-202) represents the Eucharist as a true Sacrifice, and asserts that Christ Himself is the Victim offered. "The Church alone offers this pure oblation to the Creator, offering to Him with thanksgiving things of His creation. But the Jews do not offer; their hands are full of blood, for they have not received the Word, who is offered to God" (*Adv. Hær.*, iv., 18, 4).

St. Irenæus plainly mentions the Consecration and the Communion. He writes: "For as the bread, which is produced from the earth, when it receives the invocation of God (Consecration), is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist . . . so also our bodies, when they receive the Eucharist (Communion), are no longer corruptible, holding the hope of resurrection to eternity" (*Ibid.*, iv., 18, 5).

Tertullian (160-220) speaks of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as a symbol of Christ's redeeming Blood on the Cross, *i. e.*, a representation of the Sacrifice of Calvary. In referring to the mysteries of Mithra, he declares that the devil imitated the Christian Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation and the Eucharist, "the oblation of bread" (*De Præs.*, xv.). With him the Eucharist is not a mere meal, but the solemn offering of Bread in a religious rite, a true Sacrifice. He writes: "Will not your fast be more solemn, if you stand at the altar of God? When you receive the Body of the Lord, you place in security both the participation in the Sacrifice and the fulfillment of duty" (*De Oratione*, xix.). "Was it not because He had to be led like a lamb to the slaughter, because, as a sheep before her shearer is dumb, so was He not to open His mouth, that He so intensely wished (in eating the Pasch) to accomplish the symbol of His own redeeming Blood" (*Adv. Marcion*, iv., 40).

St. Cyprian (200-258) in the third century sets forth the Catholic doctrine on the Mass as clearly as a theologian of the twentieth. He teaches that the Eucharist is a true and complete Sacrifice; that it contains an immolated Victim; that it was

taught and founded by Christ; that it is a commemoration of the Lord's Passion, and is even identical with that Passion; that in it the Blood of Christ is offered; that it is a symbol of the Communion of the people with Christ; that it is offered for the living (the lapsed after penance) and the dead. He writes: "Christ is the Teacher and Founder of this Sacrifice. . . . Who more a priest than Jesus Christ, who offered a Sacrifice to God the Father, and offered the very same thing which Melchisedech offered, that is, bread and wine, namely His Body and Blood. . . . For if Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, is Himself the Chief Priest of God the Father, and has first offered Himself a Sacrifice to the Father, and has commanded this to be done in commemoration of Himself, surely that priest discharges the office of Christ who imitates what Christ did; and he then offers a true and full Sacrifice to God the Father in the Church, when he proceeds to offer it according to the manner in which he sees Christ to have offered. . . . Because we make mention of the Passion in all Sacrifices (for the Lord's Passion is the Sacrifice which we offer), we ought to do nothing else but what He did. For the Sacred Scriptures say, as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye show forth the Lord's death until He come. . . . The Blood of Christ is not offered up, if there be no wine in the cup. . . . In the wine is shown the Blood of Christ. . . . When the water is mingled with the wine in the Cup, the people are made one with Christ" (*Epis.* 63). "If anyone should do this (*i. e.*, make a priest executor of one's will) no offering should be made for him, nor should any Sacrifice be offered for his repose" (*Epis.*, i., 2). The Mass must not be said for the lapsed until after they have had performed penance (*Epis.*, xv., 2; xvi., 2, 3).

Bibliography: Pierse, *The Mass in the Infant Church.* D. July, Oct., 1890.

Is not the Mass derogatory to the Sacrifice of the Cross? Was not the Sacrifice of Jesus on the Cross all-sufficient? St. Paul says: "By one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified" (Heb. x. 14), and "We are sanctified through the offering of the Body of Jesus Christ once for all" (Heb. x. 10).

The Mass is not derogatory to the Sacrifice of the Cross, as the Council of Trent has defined (Sess. xxi., can. 4). The Catholic Church has always taught the all-sufficiency of the one Sacrifice of our redemption. The fullness of the price once paid, the Blood of Christ, makes all other payment impossible; the immolation of Calvary renders all repetition useless. But "immolation is only one element of sacrifice, and indeed not the one

that has to be performed by the priest, or sacrificer. The priestly element is oblation. The oblation has been performed by Christ, St. Thomas remarks, in such wise, that it may be renewed by us. The immolation has been done once, and need not be repeated, and cannot be repeated. But the offering can, and should be, of daily recurrence, according to Christ's command: "This do for the commemoration of Me" (1 Cor. xi. 24). Now the Sacrifice being not the mactation or immolation, but the offering up of what is either slain or to be slain, it follows that our daily celebration is also a daily Sacrifice" (De la Taille, *Catholic Faith in the Eucharist,* 113, 114).

What prayers does the priest recite during Mass?

As a preparation for Mass the priest recites the forty-second Psalm, "Judge me O God," and confesses his sins (Confiteor) so that he may worthily offer up the Holy Sacrifice. In the fourth century, converts about to make their first Communion, recited this appropriate Psalm. The Introit (Entrance), originally a Psalm with an antiphon, was recited as the priest went in solemn procession to the altar. It is generally the keynote to the day's Mass. The *Kyrie Eleison* (Matt. xvii. 15; xx. 30; Luke xvii. 13) is a cry to God for mercy, and is taken from the ancient litanies that were the distinguishing features of the processions of the early Church. The *Gloria in excelsis* is one of the oldest Catholic prayers, although it was not introduced into the Mass until the seventh century.

A second division of the Mass includes the Collects, the Epistle, the Gradual, Sequence, Tract, and the Gospel. These readings from the Prophets, the Epistles and the Gospels are mentioned by St. Justin in the second century. He writes: "On the day of the sun all who live in towns, or in the country, gather together in one place, and the memoirs of the Apostles, or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits" (*Apol.,* i., 65). The Collects, or Prayers, allude to the feast of the day, or are prompted by some special need of the time, *v. g.,* prayers for the army and navy in war time. The reading of the Gospel was from the earliest times followed by a sermon. The Nicene Creed was recited at Mass in the East from the sixth, and in the West from the ninth century.

The Offertory is so named from the gifts of bread and wine for the Sacrifice made by the people, who often added oil for the sacred lamps, and incense. The Offertory prayer presents the bread and wine to God, asking Him that "this unspotted Host" and "the Chalice of Salvation" may in view of the Consecration "be available to life everlasting."

The essential and most solemn part of the Mass is the Canon, which begins with the Preface and ends with the *Pater*

Noster. The central prayer of the Canon consists of the words of institution, mentioned as early as the second century by St. Justin (*Apol.,* i., 65). It is preceded and followed by prayers equally ancient. The Preface with its thrice repeated Sanctus (Isa. vi. 3; Matt. xxi. 9; Apoc. iv. 8) may be found in St. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat.* 5). The *Te igitur* asks God's acceptance of the Sacrifice, and prays for the Pope, the Bishop and all the faithful. The commemoration of the living and the *Communicantes,* which united the faithful with our Lady and the Saints, call to mind the diptychs or tablets, which in the Eastern liturgies contained the names of those who were to be remembered. The *Anamnesis,* which follows the Consecration commemorates the Passion, Resurrection and Ascension of Christ. The conclusion of this prayer, which Duchesne regards as the Latin equivalent to the Greek *Epiklesis,* beseeches God to have the Sacrifice carried by the hands of His angel to His altar on high (Apoc. viii. 3). The priest then commemorates the fathful departed who "repose in the sleep of peace." The Canon of the Mass ends with the Lord's Prayer, which was inserted in this place by Pope Gregory the Great (*Epis.,* ix., 12).

The breaking of bread which follows is done in memory of Christ's own action at the Lord's Supper (Matt. xxvi. 26), and the placing of half of the Host into the chalice symbolizes the unity of the Sacrament. The *Agnus Dei* was introduced into the Mass by Pope Sergius (687-701), and the Communion Prayer dates from the fourth century. The priest's blessing at the end of Mass has been used from the eleventh century, and the Gospel of the Incarnation from the time of Pope Pius V (1566-1572).

How do you know that Masses will take souls out of Purgatory? Do you pretend to know the secrets of God?

The Council of Trent, which voices the teaching of the early Fathers and all the ancient liturgies, Eastern and Western, teach that "the Mass is a propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and the dead, and that the souls in Purgatory are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but chiefly by the acceptable Sacrifice of the Altar" (Sess. xxv.; Sess. vi., can. 30; Sess. xii., ch. 2, can. 3).

Tertullian writes in the beginning of the third century: "We make on one day every year oblations for the dead, as for their birthdays" (*De Cor. Mil.,* 3). Again he writes: "The faithful widow prays for the soul of her husband, and begs for him in the interim refreshment, and in the first resurrection companionship, and offers on the anniversary day of his death" (*De Monog.,* 10).

St. Augustine writes: "Lay," she (St. Monica, his mother) says, "this body anywhere; let not the care of it in any way disturb you; this only I ask of you, that you should remember me at the altar of the Lord, wherever you be" (*Conf.*, ix., 27).

Why do you charge for Masses? Is not this the sin of Simon Magus (Acts viii. 18-24)? Why do you exact a fixed sum to get people out of Purgatory by your Masses? Does not a rich man thereby have an unjust advantage over a poor man, simply because he leaves a priest money to pray him out of Purgatory?

There is no simony in accepting stipends of money for Masses, because, as St. Thomas says (IIa. IIæ., Q. 100, art. 2, ad. 2), the priest accepts them as a payment for his support, but not as the price of his Mass. The Canon Law forbids simony, which it defines as "a deliberate eagerness to buy or sell for a temporal price anything intrinsically spiritual" (Canon 727). The Church allows a priest to accept stipends for Masses (Canon 824), and condemned Wyclif in the fifteenth century for falsely calling the custom simonaical.

In the primitive Church the faithful offered bread and wine at each Mass they attended, often placing money upon the altar for the use of the clergy and the poor. The practice of giving the priest a money alms for a Mass dates from the seventh or eighth century, and became a universal practice in the twelfth.

The Church allows the priest to receive money for but one Mass a day, except on Christmas, and legislates severely against all trading in Masses (Canon 827). If more Masses are asked for than a priest can say, he is bound to send them to priests in poor parishes where few offerings are made, or to priests on the foreign missions.

The Scriptures prove that by divine law the Church has the right to demand from the people the support of the clergy (Matt. x. 10; Luke x. 7; 1 Cor. ix. 7, 14). But the custom of accepting stipends for Masses is proved only by tradition, *i. e.*, the Church's approval for the past twelve hundred years. As the divine teacher of Christ's revelation, she cannot make any universal law contrary to the natural or positive divine law.

Non-Catholics generally suppose that five hundred Masses have five hundred times the efficacy of one. This is not the case. The value of the Mass is infinite, because Christ is the Minister of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. He delegates the priest to act in His name, and actually performs Himself the sacrificial action in each Mass. But while the merits presented to God in the Mass are infinite, their application to individuals is finite, and only to be measured by the acceptance of God. We know

in a general way that God will answer our prayers, but how He will apply the fruit of a particular Mass, we do not pretend to know. The Church at every Mass remembers all her children, living and dead; the particular application of the infinite merits of Christ are known to God alone. The rich in giving alms have no advantage over the poor, for each one is bound to give alms in proportion to his means. If he were to neglect giving alms, he would be in a far worse position than the poor man, who cannot give what he does not possess.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Keller, *Mass Stipends;* Macdonald, *The Sacrifice of the Mass,* xii.; Thurston, *Masses for Money.* R. C. iv. 381.

Why do you say Mass in Latin, a language the people do not understand? Would not the people be better able to follow the services, if they were in the language of the congregation? Does not St. Paul condemn your Church's use of Latin at Mass when he says: "Yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue" (1 Cor. xiv. 19)?

A colored Catholic of Richmond once told me that he answered this question put him by a Methodist minister by asking another: "Does not the Lord understand Latin?" A perfect answer, because it reminded his questioner that the Mass was a sacrificial action performed by the priest, as the representative of Christ, and, therefore, something utterly distinct from a sermon addressed to the people.

The language of the Mass prayers is in itself unimportant, for the Church has never found fault with the Uniate Churches for using other languages. Thus, for example, the Italo-Greeks of Southern Italy have said Mass in Greek for over a thousand years, while the Melkites of Syria, Palestine and Egypt use Arabic and Greek. The Byzantine rite is used by the Eastern Orthodox Church in fourteen different languages, but the Mass is the same in all.

Greek was originally the language of the Roman liturgy. Latin superseding it by the beginning of the fifth century. Conservative Rome and the nations of the West converted by her missionaries, retained the Latin tongue in the Mass, to strengthen the bond of unity, and to express her unchanging worship in an idiom free from the perpetual changes of the vernacular. Imagine Catholics of the twentieth century compelled to decipher an obsolete English liturgy of the days of King Alfred the Great!

Even the most ignorant Catholic knows the central part of

the Mass, the Consecration of our Lord's Body and Blood, and by constant attendance he soon comes to know the most important prayers which precede and follow it. Moreover, the whole liturgy is translated to-day in every language of the world, and books explaining its every part abound. While many intelligent Catholics read the Missal with the priest, this is not essential. One may attend Mass with profit and devotion by meditating on the Passion of Christ, by reciting prayers in honor of our Lady and the saints in union with Christ, or by reading a spiritual book.

St. Paul (1 Cor. xiv. 19) is not referring to the Mass, but to the gift of tongues (Mark xvi. 17; Acts ii. 4; x. 46; xix. 6; 1 Cor. xii), *i. e.*, to Christians speaking in foreign languages, which they had never learned. He mentions the need of praying for the gift of interpretation (1 Cor. xiv. 13), else their gift might become useless, like musical instruments producing noise instead of music (1 Cor. xiv. 7). He does not condemn the gift itself, for he says that he himself possesses it (I thank my God I speak with all your tongues), and he adds: "Forbid not to speak with tongues" (1 Cor. xiv. 39).

Why did the translators of the King James version add the word "unknown" in verses 2, 4, 13, 14, 19, 27, and omit the same word in verses 18 and 39, where the gift is approved? Was this honest?

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist;* Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul.*

THE VESTMENTS

Why do priests wear such strange garments at Mass? Why different colors? What are the names of the garments worn by Bishops and priests? Do these vestments come from the Jews? Have they a mystic meaning?

The vestments worn to-day by the priest at Mass, with the one exception of the amice, represent the ordinary daily dress of the second century Roman. The toga is the only Roman garment that has disappeared, because the early Christians, not being citizens as a rule, could not and did not wear it.

According to medieval liturgists, especially from the ninth century onwards, the vestments were said to symbolize the priestly virtues, the Incarnation, the instruments of Christ's Passion, the weapons of the priest's warfare in God's service. But the vestments did not begin as symbols. They were the everyday clothes of the Roman, which a conservative Church kept in use, after the fashions of the secular world had utterly changed. They are indeed an excellent witness of the Church's

continuity. The clergy of a modern Church wears the dress of the modern citizen.

The priest's vestments are as follows:

The *Amice* (ninth century) is an oblong piece of linen, sometimes embroidered at its upper edge, placed over the shoulders. It was originally a hood to cover the head and ears in a cold church, or, as others maintain, a scarf to protect the throat.

The *Alb* was the long, dignified white tunic, which the Roman wore under his other clothes. The surplice of the priest and the rochet of the bishop is a shortened alb.

The *Cincture* is a belt or sash of white or colored rope with tassels. To walk the streets with one's tunic loose was a sign of effeminacy among the Romans.

The *Maniple* was originally a white linen handkerchief carried in the left hand, or thrown over the left arm, used in touching the sacred vessels. Later on it became a mere ornament, and was made of colored silk and embroidered.

The *Stole* was a long scarf (lorum) worn by Roman officials and magistrates when on duty. It is used to-day when the priest administers the Sacraments, as a badge of his authority.

The *Chasuble,* the *penula* of St. Paul (2 Tim. iv. 13), was a large hooded rain-cloak, worn by the Roman soldiers, which we see pictured on Trajan's Column at Rome. Originally a beautiful bell-shaped garment, it has been so cut away since the fifteenth century as to be almost unrecognizable.

The *Cope,* worn by the priest in processions, at Vespers, at Benediction, and during the Asperges before Mass, is merely a divided chasuble, joined with a clasp. The deacon's *Dalmatic* was an outer tunic, introduced from Dalmatia into Rome in the time of Diocletian (284-305). The subdeacon's *Tunicle* is a shortened dalmatic.

The distinguishing features of the Bishop's vestments are the *rochet* (a shortened alb), a small and large cope (*mozzetta, cappa magna*) *sandals, silk stockings, gloves,* the *mitre,* and the *pallium* worn only by Archbishops. The *crozier* is a symbol of his authority and jurisdiction, the *ring* a sign of his betrothal to the Church, and the *mitre,* a folding cap, corresponds to the priest's *biretta* and the Pope's *tiara.* The *pectoral cross* is a modern ornament, dating only from the seventeenth century.

The *Pallium* was the poor man's cloak mentioned by Tertullian (*De Pallio*), worn in Rome by those who were not Roman citizens. It was a broad piece of linen, thrown over the left shoulder, and brought round in front under the left arm. Part of the white wool in its make-up to-day is supplied by two lambs, presented annually as a tax by the Canons to the Chapter of St. John Lateran's on the feast of St. Agnes. The Pope wears it as a sign of his supreme pastoral office, and the Arch-

bishop as an earnest of his share in the Pope's plenary power. The Popes sent the pallium to the English Archbishops from the time of St. Augustine to the Reformation as a symbol of their union with Rome—a solid argument against the Anglican claim of continuity (Thurston, *The Pallium*).

The Pope's *Tiara,* a bee-hive papal crown, is a non-liturgical ornament, worn only in processions, and at solemn acts of jurisdiction, such as dogmatic decisions. It developed into the double and triple crown under Popes Boniface VIII (1294-1310) and Benedict XII (1334-1342). It was a part of the Byzantine court dress, and was first used by the Popes of the eighth century.

The Roman rite uses six colors to-day for the sacred vestments—white for purity and innocence, red for martyrdom, rose for joy, green for hope, purple for penance, and black for mourning.

Bibliography: Bishop, *Liturgica Historica,* 260; Braun, *Die Liturgische Gewandung;* Fortescue, *The Vestments of the Roman Rite;* Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist;* Henry, *Catholic Customs and Symbols;* Wilpert, *Le Pitture delle Catacombe; Die Gewandung der Christen.* C. E. xiv. 714; xv. 358.—C. W. cxvii. 39.—D. Jan., 1897.—D. L. ii. 2779-2794; iii. 1174-1199.

SIN

What is sin? Are not all sins equal in the sight of God? Is not this the teaching of the Scriptures? St. James says: "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all" (James ii. 10).

Sin is the conscious and free transgression of the law of God, an express opposition to and a contempt of the Divine Will, a deliberate turning away from God as our Ultimate End (Apoc. i. 11). It is the greatest of evils, because it deprives God of the honor due Him, and hinders man's attainment of his eternal destiny.

Luther taught that all sins were of equal malice, and the distinction between mortal and venial sins absurd, because he erroneously held that even the smallest sin contained the deadly poison of concupiscence (Grisar, *Luther,* i., 102; vi., 514). His teaching was condemned by the Council of Trent (Sess. vi., ch. 11; canons 23, 25). It is also contrary to reason and the Sacred Scriptures. Reason plainly declares there is a clear-cut difference between a sudden outburst of temper due to a nervous strain (a venial sin), and a deliberate sin of murder or adultery (mortal sin). The following texts evidently refer to the just: "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves" (1 John i. 8); "In many things we all offend" (James iii. 2).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Galtier, *Le Peché et la Pénitence;* Janvier, *Conferences de Nôtre Dame,* 1907, 1908; Mahoney, *Sin and Repentance;* Manning, *Sin and Its Consequences;* Vaughan, *Venial Sin.*

THE UNPARDONABLE SIN

Are there not certain sins that God cannot pardon? Does not Christ speak of the sin against the Holy Ghost "that shall not be forgiven in this world or the world to come" (Matt. xii. 31, 32; Mark iii. 28-30; Luke xii. 10)? Does not St. John speak of a "sin into death" (John v. 16, 17)? Does not St. Paul teach that "it is impossible for those who were once enlightened . . . if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance" (Heb. vi. 4, 6)?

No sin is unpardonable, absolutely speaking, either by God, or the Church that forgives in God's name. God wills all men to be saved (1 Tim. ii. 4), and His mercy is infinite. The contrite sinner will always be pardoned. The texts brought forward have reference to the sinner who refuses to repent, despite the graces God bestows upon him. Such a one does not actually receive God's pardon, because he does not ask it, or fulfill the conditions necessary for obtaining it.

The sin mentioned by our Savior was the willful rejection by the Pharisees of the miracles He wrought in proof of His divine mission, and the malicious ascribing them to the power of Beelzebub, the prince of devils.

Some of the Fathers (St. John Chrysostom) asserts that Heb. vi. 4 refers to Baptism (*In Epis. ad Heb.,* ix., 4), while others (St. Jerome) holds that it means the sin of final impenitence (*Cont. Jovin,* 2).

The Novatians of the third century, who limited the Church's pardoning power, were condemned by Pope Cornelius (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.,* vi., 43). St. Augustine says of them: "They were excluded from the Church and became heretics. Our kind Mother, the Church, never ceases to be merciful, no matter what sins have been committed" (Ser. 352, 9).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: D'Alès, *L'Edit de Calliste;* Conway, *Studies in Church History.*

THE OCCASIONS OF SIN

My Church taught me in childhood that dancing, gambling of all kinds, and theatre-going were sinful. I still think so after years of experience. Will you explain why your Church is so lenient in such matters?

The Catholic Church teaches that sin is the greatest of evils, and that every Catholic should not only avoid it, but also the occasions of sin. An occasion of sin is an external circumstance, which leads one to commit sin. Any person, place or thing that generally leads us to commit sin becomes a proximate occasion, that we are bound to avoid. If not, we freely choose the sin. God delights in seeing His people enjoy themselves in an innocent manner. His Church never has condemned dancing, card playing or theatre-going in themselves as evil; she frowns on them only when they become proximate occasions of sin.

Dancing among the Jews usually expressed the people's rejoicing, as the dancing of Mary and the women of Israel after the crossing of the Red Sea (Exod. xv. 20), of Jepthe's daughter after her father's victory (Jud. xi. 34), of David before the Ark (2 Kings vi. 5, 22). The modern dance for recreation and social fellowship is, as St. Francis de Sales says, morally indifferent, although it may become an occasion of sin, if the dance is itself suggestive of immorality (St. Augustine, Ser. ix., 3; *In Joan.*, iii., 19), if the companions are wicked men and women, if excessive whiskey drinking is the rule, as happens frequently under our present prohibition law.

To play games of skill like golf or chess, or games of pure chance like poker or fan-tan for a stake, is not in itself sinful. I may lawfully spend my money for recreation, and give my neighbors some of it, if they prove more skillful or more lucky than myself. A game of poker becomes of interest only when some stake is in sight for the winners. Gaming becomes sinful, if we force a person to play against his will, if we cheat, if we stake money not our own, or use money needed for our debts or for the support of our families.

Betting also is not sinful in itself, if the event at issue is really uncertain, if both parties understand the bet in the same way, and if both are prepared to pay if they lose.

But all Catholic moralists are agreed that gambling and betting may lead to grave abuse and sin, especially when they are prompted by mere gain. The gambler usually frequents bad company, wastes much valuable time, becomes adverse to hard work, is strongly tempted to be dishonest when luck is against him, and often brings financial ruin upon himself and those dependent upon him.

Theatre-going, condemned absolutely by the old time Puritan or Methodist, may be an innocent form of recreation, so innocent indeed that some confessors at times have advised their morbid scrupulous penitents to attend a good play. The modern drama can be traced back to the morality and miracle plays of the Middle Ages (Sepet, *Origines Catholiques du Théatre Moderne*).

It is sinful to attend a play that is clearly immoral or irreligious, as are many of the modern plays which run for months in the capitals of America and Europe. There is little excuse for a Catholic in New York City to-day attending a wicked play, for he may be guided by the White List which the Church authorities publish in the *Catholic News*, and by the critiques in Catholic reviews like the *Commonweal, America* and *The Catholic World.*

Bibliography: D. L. iv. 107-134.

PROHIBITION

Why do Catholics object to prohibition? Is the Volstead Act binding in conscience? Was not Senator Borah right when he said that the prohibition laws involved the very existence of our government?

"The moral objection to prohibition," writes Father Keating, "is that it is an unwarranted limitation of human liberty and human responsibility, preventing a practice which is not evil in itself, as a means of preventing its abuse. Were the principle morally admissible, there is nothing to check its extension to the innumerable other ways in which man, dowered with liberty, chooses evil rather than good, or the less good rather than the better. Individuals would profit greatly if access to various luxuries—tobacco, fashionable clothes, idle travel, motor cars—were denied them. It is possible that more money is spent uselessly than is spent productively; there is an immense scope for the experiments of the prohibitionist in the gross materialism of the day. But enforced virtue is no virtue at all. Virtue is the determination of the free will toward good in spite of temptation to evil. If it were possible by law to deprive people of the sense of taste, the prohibitionist on his principles would be justified in doing so" (*M.*, Nov., 1927).

The prohibition law is a penal law not binding in conscience, because the drink evil has never assumed such enormous proportions in the United States as to render imperative so radical an interference with the liberty of its citizens; and again it is not the only remedy capable of keeping the drink evil within narrow limits (Burkett, *Charities Review*, June, 1918). It is one of the strangest phenomena in history that a nation like ours, in no way remarkable for its asceticism, should have passed a law of compulsory self-denial, which no religious order of the Catholic Church, however strict, would dream of enforcing upon its members striving after the perfect life. One can only explain this strange happening, when we realize that the legislators themselves never intended to observe the law they passed.

The law has been a miserable fiasco. It has fostered hypocrisy, inasmuch as thousands of our public officers, Federal and State, do not dream of practicing what they preach; it has encouraged bribery on a great scale among the police, custom-house officers, and enforcement agents; it has substituted the evils of the night-club and the speakeasy by the tens of thousands for the evils of the open saloon; it has diverted millions of the public revenue into the hands of bootleggers and bribed State officials; it has encouraged disrespect for law, by its lax and unfair enforcement, its drastic and unfair penalties (*v. g.*, the Jones Law), the refusal of juries to convict despite the evidence, and the unpunished murders of its agents; it has brought liquor into countless homes, thus debauching the youth of the nation; it has intensified class hatred by depriving the poor of their cheap glass of beer, while the rich enjoy an unlimited supply of costly wines and liquors.

Dr. Ryan writes: "The non-commercial and private manufacture, possession and transportation of liquor for consumption by oneself or one's friends, remain lawful in the field of conscience and morality. The provisions of the Volstead Act which prohibits these actions are not binding in conscience, because they constitute unjust interference with personal liberty; nor are they justified on the theory that they are necessary or even useful means for attaining the end of the law, which is the abolition of the liquor traffic and the evils therewith connected" (*C. W.*, May, 1925).

The contention of Senator Borah that a constitutional mandate is always morally obligatory until repealed is shown to be unfounded by Dr. Ryan in an article of the *Commonweal* (April 3, 1929). What of the long continued disregard of that part of the Fourteenth Amendment which requires the congressional representation of a State to be reduced proportionately, whenever the right to vote is denied to any of its adult citizens? What of the flagrant disregard of the Fifteenth Amendment in several Southern States? What of the Blue Laws of New England or New Jersey, which have been repealed indirectly by the citizens, who persistently disobey them? "Is it not just possible," he asks, "that, in a similar situation, disregard of the Volstead Act and the Eighteenth Amendment will be at least equally reasonable and equally free from moral blame?"

The Catholic Church has never countenanced prohibition, and never will. In fact the Bishops of Australia and New Zealand lately condemned it as alien to the Catholic tradition. The Catholic Church has no confidence whatever in legislation that pretends to make men moral by force. She has no sympathy with legislation that wishes to make the American workmen more efficient by depriving him of a reasonable free-

dom. She always appeals to conscience, instructed not by the State, but by the divine law. Temperance with her is one of the cardinal virtues, and consists in a rational control in the use of both food and drink. The glutton commits sin by eating or drinking too much, thereby injuring his health, fostering sensuality, and weakening his mind and will.

The Catholic Church *commands* total abstinence to the man who finds drinking a proximate occasion of sin, while she *counsels* total abstinence as a voluntary practice of self-denial, as an example to the weaker brethren, and as a reparation for the sins of drunkards the world over. As St. Gregory the Great says: "The man who occasionally denies himself something licit will gain strength to refrain from things illicit" (*Moralia,* v., 12).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Keating, *The Drink Question.*

THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE

What constitutes the Sacrament of Penance?

On the part of the priest the *absolution:* "I absolve thee from thy sins in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost?" On the part of the penitent, *contrition, i. e.,* sorrow of heart and detestation of sin committed, with the resolve to sin no more; *confession; i. e.,* the declaration of sins to a priest with the purpose of obtaining forgiveness; and *satisfaction, i. e.,* the payment of the temporal punishment due forgiven sins (Council of Trent, Sess. xiv., 3).

How do you prove from the Bible that the Catholic Church has the power to forgive sin?

Christ promised St. Peter and the Apostles the power to forgive sin (Matt. xvi. 18; xviii. 18), and fulfilled that promise on the first Easter evening (John xx. 21-23).

The power of the keys implied supreme jurisdiction over the whole Church, and necessarily included the power to forgive sin, because sin alone excludes men from the kingdom of heaven. God ratified this power in St. Peter, the other Apostles and their successors, when He said: "Whatsoever thou shalt (you shall) bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven, whatsoever thou shalt (you shall) loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven" (Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18).

This promise was fulfilled when Christ said: "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you. When He had said this, He breathed on them, and He said to them: Receive ye the Holy

Ghost. Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained" (John xx. 21-23).

Why had the Father sent Him? To save sinners by pardoning their sins. "I am not come to all the just but sinners" (Matt. ix. 13). "I was not sent but to the sheep that are lost of the house of Israel" (Matt. xv. 24). "The Son of Man is come to save that which was lost" (Matt. xviii. 11). "Thou shalt call His name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins" (Matt. i. 21). "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners" (1 Tim. i. 15).

He frequently pardoned sinners; *viz.*, Magdalen (Luke vii. 47), the woman in adultery (John viii. 11), Zacheus (Luke xix. 9), the man sick of the palsy (Matt. ix. 2), the thief on the Cross (Luke xxiii. 43). The pardoning power which He exercised He bestowed upon His Apostles. As the Father had sent Him to pardon, so He sent them to pardon in His Name. "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," said Christ, because forgiving sins implies the giving of the spiritual life of grace to the sinner, and making him a temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. iii. 16).

Sins are not to be pardoned lightly, but after careful judging of the dispositions of the sinner. If he is sorry for his sins, he is forgiven by the Apostle and by God; if he refuse to repent, his sins are not forgiven by the Apostle, or by God. They are retained.

Was this pardoning power to cease with the Apostles? By no means. The very nature of the Church, which is the representative of Christ to continue His work until the end of the world (Matt. xxviii. 20), proves that the pardoning power was not a personal gift to the Apostles, but a permanent institution, to last as long as there were sinners in the world (Council of Trent, Sess. xiv., can. 3).

Bibliography: A. Q. 1880, 606.

CONFESSION

Was not the practice of Auricular Confession introduced by Innocent III at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, as Calvin maintained? Did the early Christians believe that the Church had the pardoning power?

No, the Council of Trent expressly mentions this statement of Calvin as "a vain calumny," and adds: "The Church did not, through the Lateran Council, ordain that the faithful of Christ shall confess—a thing which it knew to be necessary and it

stituted of divine right—but that the precept of Confession should be complied with at least once a year" (Sess. xiv., ch. 5).

Confession is not a human institution of Pope or Council, but a divine institution observed in the Church from the beginning. "If anyone denies either that Sacramental Confession was instituted, or is necessary for salvation, by divine right, or says that the manner of confessing secretly to a priest alone, which the Church has observed from the beginning, and doth observe, is alien from the institution and command of Christ, and is a human invention, let him be anathema" (Council of Trent, Sess. xiv., can. 6).

No one denies that Confession to-day is observed as a divine law everywhere in the Catholic Church, and that it has been universally observed in both East and West since the twelfth century. If a Pope or a General Council had instituted such a distasteful duty, there would have been a general protest against it at some period in Church history. There is no such record.

The Eastern Orthodox Church, which first separated from Rome in the ninth century, and the Lesser Eastern Churches which seceded in the fifth, have all retained Confession as a divine institution.

The medieval penitential books contain practical directions for hearing confessions; they urge the confessor to warn the penitent not to conceal his secret sins of even thought and desire, but to confess them as if he were speaking to God. The oldest, the penitential of Vinnianus (570), comes from Ireland, and the most influential was the penitential of the Greek Archbishop Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury (690). St. Columbanus introduced these books into France at the beginning of the seventh century (615).

That Catholics went to Confession in the ninth century may be proved from the penitential decrees of the Councils of Worms (868), Chalons, Tours and Rheims (813). Theodolphus, Bishop of Orleans (821), describes not merely the essentials, but even the externals of our present Sacrament of Penance. He mentions the examination of conscience, the confession of all sins, the act of contrition with the purpose of amendment, the imposing of a penance, and the absolution of the priest (Tixeront, *Confession a Divine Institution*, 7). Alcuin (735-804) speaks of the necessity of confessing one's sins to a priest, and writes a short instruction on Confession for the use of the children in the school of St. Martin of Tours (*Epis.* cxii.). St. Boniface (755), the Apostle of Germany, advises confessors to absolve their penitents immediately after confession (Statuta xxx.), St. Chrodegand (742-764), Bishop of Metz, obliges his clergy to confess their sins at least twice a year (*Regula Canonicorum*, xiv.).

St. Isidore of Seville (636) speaks of a Penance which re-

quires the ministry of the priest. It comprises four different acts: a fruitful confession, which gives back life to the soul, contrition, or sorrow for sin; reparation for sins committed, and absolution. This absolution is not merely a reconciliation with the Church, but a *mundatio,* or interior purification of the soul, effected by the ministry of the priest, and extending to all sins, no matter how grievous (*Etymol.,* vi., 19; *De Eccl. Off.,* ii., 17).

St. Gregory the Great (590-604) in his homily on John xx. 23, writes: "The Apostles, therefore, have received the Holy Spirit in order to loose sinners from the bonds of their sins. God has made them partakers of His right of judgment; they are to judge in His name and in His place. The Bishops are the successors of the Apostles, and, therefore, possess the same right." The Bishop must be just in exercising his power to retain or remit sins in God's place. He must know the sins that have been committed, and what penance the sinner has performed for them. He can obtain the exact knowledge of the penitent's sins only through Confession, and, therefore, Confession is a necessary corollary of the judicial character of the Bishop's sentence. If the Bishop has the obligation of judging, he must have a knowledge of the case to be judged. St. Gregory calls upon the sinner to make this necessary Confession with his own lips and of his own accord; an humble and sorrowful Confession is the beginning of the sinner's spiritual resurrection. The sinner confessing his sins is another Lazarus, living indeed, but still wrapped in the bonds of sin. It is the duty of the ministers of the Church to free the sinner from his bonds, which is accomplished by the priest's absolution. A tremendous ministry this for the confessor is responsible for the forgiveness he may unjustly accord or refuse. All the essentials of the Sacrament of Pneance are contained in these words (*Hom.* xxvi.): Confession, Contrition, Satisfaction and Absolution.

St. Cæsarius of Arles (470-542) writes: "It is God's will that we confess our sins not only to Him but to men, and since it is impossible for us to be free from sin, we must never fail to have recourse to the remedy of Confession" (Ser. ccliii. 1). In another sermon on the Last Judgment (ccli.), he tells his hearers "to escape damnation by making a sincere Confession from the bottom of their hearts, and to fulfill the penance given by the priest."

St. Leo the Great (440-461) writes: "God in His abundant mercy has provided two remedies for the sins of men; that they may gain eternal life by the grace of Baptism, and also by the remedy of Penance. Those who have violated the vows of their Baptism may obtain the remission of their sins by condemning themselves; the divine goodness has so decreed that

the pardon of God can only be obtained by sinners through the prayers of the priests. Jesus Christ Himself has conferred upon the rulers of the Church the power of imposing canonical penance upon sinners who confess their sins, and of allowing them to receive the Sacraments of Christ, after they have purified their souls by a salutary satisfaction. . . . Every Christian, therefore, must examine his conscience, and cease deferring from day to day the hour of his conversion; he ought not to expect to satisfy God's justice on his deathbed. It is dangerous for a weak and ignorant man to defer his conversion to the last uncertain days of his life, when he may be unable to confess and obtain priestly absolution; he ought, when he can, to merit pardon by a full satisfaction for his sins" (*Epis.* cviii.).

These words are so plain that some Protestants have traced the origin of Confession to St. Leo the Great. It is good to note that when he speaks of "the prayers of the priests" he is not referring to any prayers the priest might offer up for sinners, but to the priestly absolution in the Sacrament of Penance which in his time was used in the form of a prayer. This is still the custom of the Eastern churches.

In another letter addressed to the Bishops of Campania, Leo the Great declares that their custom of compelling penitents to read their sins publicly in church was against "the Apostolic rule," while at the same time he tells them that secret Confession, which is of Apostolic origin, is sufficient.

St. Augustine (354-430) tells the early Christians "not to listen to those who deny that the Church has the power to forgive all sins" (*De Agon. Christ,* 3; Ser. 295, 2). He compares the sinful conscience to an abscess filled with pus, the priest to a surgeon, and Confession to the lancing of the abscess, whereby the pus is driven forth. He warns sinners not to delay their Confession to the hour of death, because at that time they may be unable to confess their sins to a priest (*In Ps.,* lxvi., 5; Ser. 393).

St. Ambrose (340-397) declares that priests pardon all sins, not in their own name, but as "ministers and instruments of God" (*De Poen.,* i., 2).

St. Pacian of Barcelona (390), answering the objection of the Novatians that God alone can forgive sins, writes: "This is true, but that which He does through His priests is also done by His own power. For He said to His Apostles: 'Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven. Why should He speak thus, if it was not lawful for men to bind and loose?" (*Epis. Ad Symp.,* i., 6.)

St. Basil (331-379) writes: "The Confession of sins follows the same rule as the manifestation of bodily infirmities. As, therefore, men do not disclose their bodily infirmities to every-

one, nor to a few at random, but to such as are skillful in the cure of them, so also the Confession of sins ought to be made to those who are able to apply a remedy" (*Reg. Brev.*, 228). "Our fathers have not ordered us to make known women who have been guilty of adultery, and, who through a religious fear have confessed, or have in any way been convicted; for fear lest we may become the cause of their death" (*Epis. Can. Prima.*, 34).

Paulinus of Milan (395), in his life of St. Ambrose, explicitly mentions the fact that the saint heard confessions. He writes: "As often as anyone, in order to receive penitence, confessed his falls to him, he wept so as to compel him also to weep. . . . But he spoke of the causes of the crimes which they confessed to none but the Lord alone" (*Vita Ambrosii.*, 39).

The historian Socrates tells us that on occasion of the Novatian schism (251), the Bishops of Thrace decided to appoint in every place a Priest Penitentiary to take the Bishop's place; *i. e.*, a priest to hear confessions, and to see that the penitents accomplished the penance imposed upon them (*Hist. Eccles.*, v., 19). Pope Marcellus established a similar office at Rome in 308, assigning twenty-five priests in the twenty-five titular churches "for Baptism and Penance" (*Liber Pontificalis*, i., 164). According to Duchesne this implied the duty of hearing confessions.

Origen (185-254) in his commentary on Psalm xxvii. plainly speaks of a secret Confession. He writes: "When you have eaten some indigestible food, and your stomach is filled with an excessive quantity of humor, you will suffer until you have gotten rid of it. So in like manner sinners, who hide and retain their sins within their breasts, become sick therefrom almost to death. If, however, they accuse themselves, confess their sins, and vomit forth their iniquity, they will completely drive from their souls the principle of evil. Consider carefully whom you choose to hearken to your sins. Know well the character of the physician to whom you intend to relate the nature of your sickness. . . . If he gives you advice, follow it; if he judges that your sickness is of such a nature that it should be revealed publicly in church for the edification of the brethren and your own more effective cure, do not hesitate to do what he tells you."

St. Cyprian (200-258) also mentions secret Confession in his treatise *De Lapsis*, 28, 19. During the persecution of Decius (249-251) many Christians had apostatized, either by offering sacrifice to idols (*sacrificati*), or by obtaining official certificates, falsely declaring that they had done so (*libellatici*). The condemns the priests who had admitted these apostates to Communion without having undergone any public penance (*Epis.*, xvi., 2), and urges those guilty even of sins of thought to confess

them. He writes: "Although these Christians have not committed the crime of either the *sacrificati* or the *libellatici,* yet because they have thought of apostatizing, they are bound to accuse themselves in all simplicity and sorrow to the priests of the Lord, to fulfill their public penance, and to unburden their sins. . . . Let each one of you confess his sins, while his confession may still be received, and his satisfaction and the absolution of the priest are pleasing to the Lord."

That the Catholic Church claimed the pardoning power over all sins is evident from the Edict of Pope Callistus (217-222), mentioned by Tertullian (160-220) in the opening chapter of his book on Modesty. He writes: "I hear that there has been an Edict set forth, and a peremptory one, too. The *Pontifex Maximus*—that is, the Bishop of Bishops—issues an Edict; 'I remit the sins both of adultery and fornication to such as have fulfilled (the requirements of) penance.'" Whether this proves a profound revolution in the Church's penitential discipline which hitherto had excommunicated in perpetuity Christians guilty of the three capital sins of murder, apostasy and impurity (Vacandard, Batiffol, Rauschen) or merely sanctioned the traditional discipline rejected by the third century Montanists (d'Alès) is immaterial. The Montanist Tertullian, like all heretics, denied the divine authority of the Church, and consequently her power to pardon all sins. His angry protest is at once a witness to the Bishop of Rome's claim to the Primacy, and a clear proof of the Church's pardoning power.

Bibliography: D'Alès, *L'Edit de Calliste; De Sacramento Pœnitentiæ;* Batiffol, *Etudes d'Histoire,* i., 45-222; Harney, *The Confession of Sins;* O'Donnell, *Penance in the Early Church;* Pohle, *The Sacraments,* iii., 181-216; Rauschen, *Eucharist and Penance;* Thurston, *The Church and the Confessional;* Tixeront, *Confession a Divine Institution;* Vacandard, *Etudes de Critique,* iii., 51-125; *La Confession Sacramentelle dans l'Eglise Primitive.* A. Q. 1900, 477.—D. A. iii. 1026-1058.—D. L. iii. 2515-2544.—D. T. i. 138-255; iii. 827-974.—R. C. vi. 426; xii. 465; xiv. 193, 399; xv. 195; xvii. 385; xviii. 142; xx. 329, 566; xxiv. 113, 241; xxvii. 447, 600; xxix. 561.

Why do you not allow Confession to be optional as in our Church?—*High Churchman.*

Because the Sacrament of Penance is necessary of divine right, as the Council of Trent teaches (Sess. xiv., canons 6, 7). As Jesus Christ established the pardoning power for the forgiveness of post-baptismal sin, every Christian is bound to be pardoned in the way He divinely appointed.

St. Augustine thus answers this question. He says: "Do penance, as it is done in the Church, in order that the Church may pray for you. Let no one say to himself: 'I do penance

secretly before God; God knows it, and He will forgive me, because I am doing penance in my heart.' Has it, therefore, been said without reason: 'Whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven.' Have the keys been given to the Church of God in vain? Are we to frustrate the Gospel and the words of Christ?" (Ser. 392.)

Do not the words "to forgive sins" in John xx. 23 simply mean the declaration that sins are forgiven, or the power to preach the Gospel?

No, both these interpretations of the Reformers were expressly condemned by the Council of Trent. "The absolution of a priest is not a bare ministry only, whether of announcing the Gospel, or of declaring that sins are forgiven, but it is after the manner of a judicial act, whereby sentence is pronounced by the priest as a judge" (Sess. xiv., cap. 6, can. 9).

This is clear from the words of Christ, who gave the Apostles the power either to bind or loose; either to forgive or to retain sins (Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18; John xx. 23). Christ does not say a word about *declaring* sins forgiven, or lead us to believe that forgiveness of sins is merely the power to preach the Gospel. If men were justified by faith alone as Luther taught, the forgiveness of sins would ultimately depend upon preaching the Gospel. But, as we have seen above (p. 223), the Lutheran theory of justification plainly contradicts the Scriptures.

St. Jerome writes: "The priests have the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and, after a fashion, exercise the office of judges before the day of judgment" (*Epis.* 14, *Ad Heliod.* 8).

Where in the Bible is auricular Confession taught?

Auricular Confession is nowhere expressly mentioned in the Bible, but Christ Himself divinely commanded it by giving His Apostles the power to remit and retain sins (John xx. 23). The Sacrament of Penance is a judgment, requiring on the part of the priest-judge an accurate knowledge of the nature, number and circumstances of the sins committed. This can be known only through the penitent himself, who is at once defendant, prosecutor and witness in this divine, secret tribunal (Council of Trent, Sess. xiv., canons 6, 7). In a word the sinner must lay bare his soul to the priest, so that he may be able to know the state of his conscience, and, convinced of his sorrow, give him a fitting and an adequate penance.

Does not the confessional give the priest too much power, and enable him to interfere with a man's private affairs?

Not at all. His only power is a power delegated by Christ, whose minister he is (1 Cor. iv. 1) to forgive sins in His name, and to advise, warn, threaten and encourage souls in their daily conflict with temptation and sin. He has no right whatever to pry into a penitent's private affairs. He can question him only about sin and its occasions, and the more intelligent and careful the sinner's confession, the less will he be questioned by his confessor.

The priest undoubtedly has the right to declare the moral law authoritatively, and to enforce obedience to the commandments of God and the precepts of the Church under penalty of denying absolution. He has no right whatever to enforce his private opinions upon his penitent.

If, as you claim, you possess the Apostolic power of pardoning sin, why do you priests not also possess the power to work miracles, which Jesus conferred upon them (Matt. x. 1, 8; Mark xvi. 17, 18; Luke ix. 2; John xiv. 12)?

Because, whereas the pardoning power is an essential part of the threefold divine commission of teaching, pardoning and sanctifying the souls of men, the extraordinary gift of miracles is not essential. Christ gave the Apostles the power to perform miracles, to prove that the Kingdom of God was at hand, and they were His accredited messengers. He promised this gift to His Church forever as a characteristic mark of her holiness, and the holiness of her saints. God does frequently work miracles through the ordinary administration of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, which He established for the cure of the body as well as of the soul; but miracles are exceptional things, and not an ordinary prerogative of either His divine ministry or of the average Christian.

To infer from the above texts that Christ gave the gift of healing to a certain class of men or to all His followers, as some modern faith healers do, is illogical, and goes counter to the constant tradition of the Church from the beginning. If they insist upon taking Christ's words as literally applicable to all, we challenge them to speak with new tongues, to handle deadly serpents, and to drink poisons with impunity.

The Catholic Church protests equally against modern unbelief which denies the possibility of miracles, and modern superstitious cults which make every Christian a wonder worker.

How can a priest listen year after year to the recital of sins without his own mind becoming corrupted?

Because God gives His priests special graces to keep their minds and hearts pure, especially by means of daily Mass, daily reading of the breviary, and frequent confession. The priest, moreover, listens to the sins of men like another Christ, with sympathy and love for the repentant sinner, who causes "more joy in heaven than the ninety-nine just that need not penance" (Luke xv. 7). The more he understands the malice of sin, and its evil effects upon the sinner, the more he hates it as the world's greatest evil.

Does the judge on the bench or the physician in the city hospital become corrupt, because he comes in daily contact with sin and the effects of sin? No reasonable man would say so. The heart becomes corrupt only by constantly yielding to temptation.

THE SEAL OF THE CONFESSIONAL

Is a priest always bound to keep secret the sins revealed to him in confessions? Ought he not be obliged to give a murderer up to justice?

Yes, a priest is bound by the natural law, the divine law and the law of the Church to keep absolutely secret whatever he hears in Confession. As early as the sixth century the Second Synod of Dovin in Armenia decreed: "A priest who reveals the confession of the pentitents shall be deposed with anathema." The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) commanded confessors "not to betray the sinner in any manner, whether by word or sign or in any other way," and decreed that priests guilty of this crime "be deposed from their office, and imprisoned in a monastery for life." The New Code of Canon Law (Canon 2369) says: "The priest, who dares break the seal of Confession directly, remains under excommunication reserved in most special manner to the Holy See." Priests are forbidden even to speak about what they have heard in Confession, whether in private conversation or in sermons, no matter in what form or under what pretext this is done. (*Instruction of the Holy Office,* June 19, 1915.)

This law admits of no exceptions. A priest may not break the seal of Confession, either to save his own life or his own good name, to save the life of another, or to further the aims of justice. This is eminently reasonable, for no criminal would dream of going to Confession, if he knew the confessor were bound to reveal his crime to the State authorities. The civil courts recognize the confessor's privilege of silence both here and abroad. It was embodied in the law of New York State in 1828 on occasion of the trial of the Jesuit, Father Kohlmann, who refused to re-

veal in court information he had received under the seal of Confession.

The whole question is treated in detail by Father Bertrand Kurtscheid in *A History of the Seal of Confession.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. Jan., 1892.—D. T. iii. 960-974.—I. T. Jan., July, 1913.

Does not Confession weaken character? Is not Confession an incentive to sin by making forgiveness easy?

No, on the contrary, Confession strengthens character by its insistence upon supernatural motives for sorrow, and prevents many a sin, making the sinner realize its heinousness in the sight of God, and its disastrous consequences here and hereafter.

If Confession were an incentive to sin, how is it that wicked Catholics, who give the lie to the Church by their daily lives, rarely go to Confession, while the most virtuous Catholics go frequently? How is it that Catholic fathers and mothers are glad when their children go often to Confession, and are sorrowful when they neglect this important duty? How again can you account for the countless thousands of sinners won back to God by means of good, contrite confessions?

It is much easier to confess one's sins to God, for then the sinner may easily crave pardon without fulfilling the necessary conditions. The confessor reminds the sinner that he cannot pardon him, unless he atones for the past by restoring his neighbor's good name or property, unless he is sorry from a supernatural motive, and unless he promises to avoid in the future all the proximate occasions of sin. All priests know that hardened sinners find this difficult, for at times they will depart unabsolved rather than promise amendment.

We readily admit that some Catholics go to Confession in a mechanical, perfunctory manner, without realizing the dignity and sacred character of this divine Sacrament. We know, too, that after Confession they continue doing things that would bring the blush of shame to the cheek of a decent pagan. But a Catholic yields to the temptations of the world, the flesh and the devil (Matt. xiii. 22; Rom. vii. 23; 1 Peter v. 1), not on account of the Sacrament of Penance, but because he has proved recreant to his promise of amendment.

Do you believe that a Catholic is damned if he cannot go to Confession before death, no priest being available? How about non-Catholics who do not believe in Confession?

No, God never asks us to do what is morally impossible. A Catholic in grievous sin, who cannot obey the divine law of Con-

fession because no priest is at hand, is bound to make an act of perfect contrition, which at once reconciles him to God (Sess. xiv, cap. 4). A non-Catholic, who is invincibly ignorant of the divine character of the Sacrament of Penance is pardoned in the same way.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: St. Francis de Sales, *Treatise on the Love of God;* Semple, *Heaven Open to Souls.*

Is not Confession degrading and unmanly?

Confession is not degrading, but on the contrary is one of the noblest acts of the true Christian, for it proves his willingness to be reconciled to God in the way He divinely appointed. It is indeed humiliating, but humility is a Christ-like virtue, especially calculated to conquer the pride of sin. Jesus said: "Learn of Me because I am meek and humble of heart" (Matt. xi. 29). The proud Pharisee who boasted of his good deeds was not pleasing to God, but the humble publican, who struck his breast, saying: " 'O God, be merciful to me, a sinner,' went down into his house justified. Because he that humbleth himself shall be exalted" (Luke xviii. 13, 14).

Confession is not unmanly, for it calls for every manly quality: intelligence, courage, humility, energy, and determination. When a dying soldier in the World War made his last Confession to the regiment's chaplain, did any of his comrades believe he was doing something degrading or unmanly?

Do Catholics have to pay for Confession?

No. To administer the Sacraments for money is simony, a grievous sin expressly forbidden by canon law (Canon 727). A Protestant once assured me that his Catholic servant had often asked money from him to pay for her Confession. One evening he followed her to find out whether she was going directly to church, as she had declared. He found her going to a theater instead. She had simply used his anti-Catholic prejudice as a means of extorting money.

I could never kneel down to a fellow man and confess all my sins. That is asking too much of flesh and blood.

Whether you find Confession an easy or a difficult matter is not the question. The true Christian simply asks: Is Confession a divine commandment, inasmuch as Christ gave the pardoning power to His priests? You are not asked to confess your sins to an ordinary man, but to a priest, who is divinely commissioned for the purpose, and carefully trained by many years of study and prayer for this unique ministry. I ask you to read Cardinal Manning's *Eternal Priesthood,* or Cardinal Gibbons'

Ambassador of Christ, if you really desire to know what the priesthood really means.

Confession indeed is difficult for the hardened sinner who does not wish to give up his wicked life, but it is full of joy and consolation to the repentant sinner, as any Catholic can tell you. A non-Catholic who is wont to confess his sins to God—and he often forgets to do even this—may, as an outsider, consider Confession to a priest a most harrowing experience, but converts, who have tasted its divine consolation, soon learn to welcome it. Many a convert after his first Confession has said to me: "Father, it was not so hard after all." Do you expect God to pardon you without the slightest suffering or mortification? Do you think your pride can be cured without the least evidence of humility?

CONTRITION AND SATISFACTION

How can our sins be forgiven by merely telling them to a priest?

Our sins cannot be pardoned by merely telling them to a priest. The Sacrament of Penance also requires Contrition or sorrow for sin, and Satisfaction or atonement for sin.

The Scriptures teach plainly that God will not forgive the sinner, unless he is truly sorry for his sins (Ps. l. 6; Isa. xxxviii. 15; Ezech. xviii. 31; Joel ii. 12, 13; Matt. xvi. 25; Luke vii. 38; xv. 13, 19; xviii. 3; Acts ii. 37).

The sinner's sorrow must be a true sorrow of the mind and will; it must embrace every grievous sin; it must be supreme, hating sin as the greatest of evils; it must be inspired by supernatural grace, and based on faith, "the beginning, root and foundation of all justification" (Council of Trent, Sess. vi., ch. 8). The detestation of sin may arise from various motives; the vileness of sin itself, the fear of hell and punishments (Imperfect Contrition), or the perfect love of God (Perfect Contrition).

Perfect Contrition "reconciles man with God before the Sacrament of Penance is actually received" (Sess. xiv., ch. 4), although it necessarily includes the desire of receiving the Sacrament. This is evident from our Lord's words: "He that hath My commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth Me. And he that loveth Me shall be loved by My Father, and I will love him" (John xiv. 21). Imperfect Contrition or Attrition suffices for the valid reception of the Sacrament of Penance. The Scriptures often appeal to the fear of God to deter men from their sins. Our Lord said: "Fear ye not them that kill the

body; but rather fear Him that can destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matt. x. 28; *Cf.* v. 30). The Council of Trent condemned Luther, who taught that "the motive of fear made man a greater sinner" (Grisar, *Luther,* i., 292), and declared that this fear "is a gift of God and an impulse of the Holy Ghost."

Not only must the sinner be truly sorry for his sins, he must also make satisfaction for them. Even when sins have been pardoned by God, there often remains the liability to temporal punishment to atone for the injury done Him, and to bring about the sinner's reformation. God often requires Satisfaction of the sinner for the transgression of His laws, both natural and supernatural. The impure man may be forgiven his sin, and yet be punished for his immorality by ill health; the murderer may be pardoned his crime, and yet have to expiate it in the electric chair. The Scriptures tell us that God pardoned Adam his disobedience, the Israelites in the desert their murmuring and idolatry, Moses his lack of faith, and David his murder, adultery and pride; but they were all severely punished by Him (Gen. iii. 19; Wisd. x. 2; Exod. xxii. 14, 27; Num. xiv. 20-23; xx. 12; Deut. xxxii. 51, 52; 2 Kings xii. 13, 14; xxiv.). St. Paul also speaks of sickness and death as temporal punishments for unworthy communions (1 Cor. xi. 30-32).

The acceptance of the Penance given in Confession is proof of the sinner's good will, and entitles him to the benefit of the Sacrament. It is given, as the Council of Trent says, "not only for the healing of the soul's weakness (a medicine of infirmity) and the preservation of a new life, but also for the avenging and punishing of past sins" (Sess. xiv., ch. 8). All the temporal punishments for sin are not necessarily forgiven by the Sacrament of Penance; some may remain to be remitted by prayer, fasting and almsgiving (Sess. vi., can. 30). This teaching is based on the Scriptures, which mention the fasting of the Ninivites (Jonas iii. 5), the prayers and penance of Manasses (2 Paral. xxxiii. 12, 13), and the almsgiving of Job (iv. 11; *Cf.* Ecclus. iii. 35).

St. Augustine (354-430) writes: "Man is forced to suffer even after his sins have been forgiven, though it was sin that caused him to fall into such misery. For the punishment outlasts the guilt, lest the guilt should be accounted slight, if with its forgiveness, the penalty also came to an end" (*In Joan.,* cxxiv., 5).

Bibliography: C. E. iv. 337.—D. T. iii. 1671-1694.—I. T. April,

INDULGENCES

Is an Indulgence a permission to commit sin?

No, an indulgence does not refer to sin at all, past, present or future. It is a remission of the whole or part of the te-a

poral punishment due to forgiven sin, granted by the Pope and the Bishops out of the Church's spiritual treasury, which is made up of the infinite redemptive merits of Jesus Christ, and the superabundant merits of the saints. It is more than the mere remission of canonical works of penance, for it really remits the whole or part of the punishment due the sinner by God, either here or in Purgatory.

The Council of Trent teaches: "Since the power of conferring indulgences was granted by Christ to the Church, and she has, even in the most ancient times, used this power, delivered unto her by God; the Holy Synod teaches and enjoins that the use of Indulgences for the Christian people, most salutary, and approved by the authority of Sacred Councils, is to be retained in the Church; and it condemns those who either assert that they are useless, or who deny that there is in the Church the power of granting them" (Sess. xxv.).

This divine power of the Church to grant indulgences may be better understood, if we compare it with the State's custom of pardoning the whole or part of the punishment inflicted by the civil law upon the criminal. The President has the right to grant a complete pardon to any criminal within the confines of the United States; the Governor to any criminal in his State. The State, moreover, remits part of a criminal's punishment for good behavior while in prison.

The State officials may grant a criminal pardon, even if he is not sorry for his crime, out of deference to powerful friends; the Church, on the contrary, never remits the punishment unless the sinner has manifested his sorrow.

Bibliography: Bellarmine, *De Indulgentiis;* Beringer, *Les Indulgences;* Hedley, *Indulgences;* Lepicier, *Indulgences;* Pohle, *The Sacraments,* iii., 233-264; Pope, *Indulgences;* Proctor, *Indulgences.* D. July, 1897; June, 1900.—D. A. ii. 718-752.—D. T. vii. 1594-1635.—M. Sept., 1922.—R. C. xxxi. 328.

Do not some writs of indulgence, especially in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, speak of an "indulgence from guilt and punishment" (*a culpa et a pœna*)? How can you maintain then that an Indulgence is not a pardon of sin?

This popular medieval formula, although inaccurate in itself, and rarely used by the Roman Chancery, can easily be understood, when we remember that it was originally used in reference to the Plenary Indulgence of the crusade or the jubilee. No one gained this Indulgence, unless he first went to Confession and was pardoned his sins, even those reserved to the Pope. After his Confession he obtained the remission of the punishment due his

forgiven sins, by fulfilling the conditions prescribed for the crusade or the jubilee.

Long before Protestantism appeared the Church called attention to the inaccuracy of this formula, as we learn from its condemnation by Pope Clement V (1305-1314) and the Council of Constance (1418).

Bibliography: D. A. ii. 739-743.

By what authority does your Church grant Indulgences? Are they mentioned in the Bible? Were they known to the primitive Church?

The power of the keys granted to St. Peter and his successors, and the unlimited power to bind and loose granted to St. Peter, the other Apostles and their successors (Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18) included everything that barred men from heaven, *i. e.*, sin and its punishment.

St. Paul exercised this power in the case of the incestuous Corinthian. He first ordered the Church of Corinth to excommunicate him for his sin (1 Cor. v. 5), and then, after he had manifested his sorrow, the Apostle pardoned him, and remitted his punishment. "For what I have pardoned, if I have pardoned anything, for your sakes have I done it, in the Person of Christ" (2 Cor. ii. 10).

In the early Church Indulgences were granted by the Bishops, who shortened the severe canonical penances of the time at the intercession of the martyrs, who gave the penitents letters of intercession (*libelli pacis*) (St. Cyprian, *Epis.*, xiii., 2; x., 4; *De Lapsis*, xvi.). That this remission was valid in God's sight is maintained by Tertullian (*De Pud.*, 22). When the era of persecutions was over, the Bishops continued to remit the canonical penances, as we learn from the Councils of Ancyra (314) and Nice (325). From the eighth century onwards the severe penances of the early Church were commuted into prayers, fasting, flagellations, pilgrimages to Rome, and to famous shrines like St. Alban's in England and San Juan de Compostella in Spain, almsgiving to churches and hospitals, going on the crusades, and making the jubilee.

Are not Pardons sold to-day in the Catholic Church? Were not Indulgences sold all over Europe in the Middle Ages? Did not the Dominican Tetzel, a most wicked man, sell Indulgences in Germany in Luther's time?

No, Pardons are not sold to-day in the Catholic Church. It is hard enough to induce some hardened sinners to go to Confession, without charging them for the privilege. A man does

not purchase his wife, if at marriage he signs over to her a portion of his property. A Protestant does not purchase a wife for ten dollars, because he gives a fee of that amount to the minister who performs the ceremony.

In 1851 a Protestant minister in England asserted publicly that Pardons for sin were sold in the Cathedral of St. Gudule's at Brussels. But the so-called catalogue of sins, which he pretended to have seen posted on the right hand door of this church's transept, proved on investigation to be a list of prices to be paid for the use of chairs! Cardinal Newman, after refuting this calumny, added: "It is utterly false to assert that it has ever been held that the perpetration of crime could be 'indulged' for any sum of money. Neither for sins committed, not sins to come, has money ever been taken as an equivalent, for one no more than the other" (*The Present Position of Catholics in England,* 113).

Catholic historians—Gasquet, Pastor, Janssen, Michaels, Paulus—have frequently mentioned the abuses connected with the preaching of Indulgences in the Middle Ages. The medieval pardoner, depicted by Chaucer in the *Pardoner's Tale,* was often an unscrupulous rascal, whose dishonesty and fraud were condemned by the Bishops of the time. We find orders for their arrest in Germany at the Council of Mainz in 1261, and in England by order of the Bishop of Durham in 1340. To indict the Church for these abuses, as Lea does in his *History of Confession and Indulgences* (iii., 284-295), is manifestly dishonest. It is comparatively easy to-day to get monies for any charitable enterprise, for we can appeal to thousands by letter, post, radio or the daily press. In the Middle Ages, when men wished to build a church or support a worthy charity, the Bishop or the Pope granted an Indulgence, which first of all called upon the people to approach the Sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist, and then "to lend a helping hand" in some special work of charity. The Council of Trent, following the Councils of Fourth Lateran, Lyons and Vienne, condemned in express terms "the wicked abuse of quaestors of alms," and, because of the great scandal they had given, "abolished their name and use" (Sess. xxiv.).

While Catholics believe that the building of St. Peter's in Rome was a matter of interest to the whole Catholic world, they heartily condemn with Grisar (*Luther,* i., 329) and Janssen (*History of the German People,* iii., 91) the manner of financing the Indulgence, and the exaggerations of the preachers in extolling unduly its effects and privileges.

No one believes to-day the calumnies against Tetzel's character. Luther did not speak the truth when he asserted that "Tetzel sold grace for money at the highest price" As both

Pastor and Grisar point out, we must carefully distinguish between Tetzel's teaching with regard to Indulgences for the living, and Indulgences applicable to the dead. With regard to Indulgences for the living, his teaching, as we know from his *Vorlegung* and his *Frankfort Theses,* was perfectly Catholic. He writes: "Indulgences do not pardon sins, but only remit the temporal punishment due to sin, when the sins have been sorrowfully confessed. . . . Indulgences do not detract from the merits of Christ, but substitute for expiatory penalties the expiatory sufferings of Christ. . . . It is a known fact that it is Christian, God-fearing, pious people, and not lewd, idle ones, who are eager to gain an Indulgence. . . . For all Indulgences are given first and foremost for the sake of God's glory. Consequently whosoever gives alms to procure an Indulgence gives primarily for God's sake, seeing that no one can obtain an Indulgence, who has not attained to true repentance and the love of God" (Grisar, *Luther,* i., 343).

"As regard Indulgences for the dead," Pastor writes, "there is no doubt that Tetzel did, according to what he considered his authoritative instructions, proclaim as Christian doctrine that nothing but an offering of money was required to gain the Indulgence for the dead, without there being any question of contrition or confession. He also taught, in accordance with an opinion then held, that an Indulgence could be applied to any given soul with unfailing effect. . . . The Papal Bull of Indulgence gave no sanction whatever to this proposition. It was a vague scholastic opinion, rejected by the Sorbonne in 1482, and again in 1518, and certainly not a doctrine of the Church" (*History of the Popes,* vii., 349). Cardinal Cajetan at the time condemned Tetzel's opinion, and taught that "while we may presume in a general way that God is willing to accept Indulgences for the dead, we have no certainty whatever that He does so in any particular case. That is the secret of God alone." In 1477 Pope Sixtus IV had expressly taught that the Church applies Indulgences for the dead "by way of suffrage," for the souls in Purgatory are no longer subject to her jurisdiction. They receive Indulgences not directly, but indirectly, through the intercession of the living.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Costelloe, *The Abuse of Indulgences;* Paulus, *Geschichte des Ablasses;* Smith, *Luther and Tetzel;* Thurston, *Indulgences for Sale.*

Are not Indulgences destructive of true religion by making Catholics trust too much in externals, such as the visiting of churches, the reciting of set prayers, and the giving of monies to the clergy? Why should not Christians suffer all the punishment due their sins?

Indulgences are most helpful to true religion, for they are never granted unless one is heartily sorry for his sins, and in the state of grace, or friendship of God. As a matter of fact they develop the sense of solidarity in Catholics by reminding them of the Communion of Saints and the infinite merits of Christ's Redemption, which make them possible. They encourage prayer, fasting, and almsgiving, urge Catholics to frequent the Sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist, insist on the frequent visiting of churches where Christ is really present, and foster devotion to the suffering souls in Purgatory.

Is it honest to accuse Catholics of externalism, when the motive prompting them to gain Indulgences is supernatural, based solely on a sense of the justice and mercy of God?

If God has established a sacramental and an extra-sacramental way of remitting the punishment due forgiven sin, it is an imperative duty as well as a privilege to use all the means of grace which He lovingly places at our disposal.

Bibliography: Paulus, *Indulgences as a Social Factor.*

Does an Indulgence of one hundred days imply that by reciting certain prayers a sinner may free himself of a hundred days punishment in Purgatory?

No, the Church is not so silly as to speak of days or years in the hereafter. She has never defined anything with regard to the meaning of an Indulgence of so many days or years. "Historically speaking, we know the genesis of this terminology. It has arisen out of the remissions of the canonical penances which were imposed for periods of time; *v. g.*, for so many years and so many quarantines, *i. e.*, Lents. But there can be no certainty even about the theory most commonly propounded that the gaining of an Indulgence of seven years would benefit the sinner to the same extent as the performance of seven years of the old canonical penance. We have no evidence to show that the old canonical penance can be taken as a constant and absolute standard" (Thurston, *Indulgences for Sale,* 6).

What do you mean by the Jubilee?

The Holy Year of Jubilee, instituted by Pope Boniface VIII in 1300, was suggested by the Jewish year of Jubilee, during which all debts were remitted, and all Jewish slaves were freed (Lev. xxv. 10). It takes the form of a Plenary Indulgence, which is granted to all the faithful who visit the Roman Basilicas of St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Mary Major and St. John Lateran, and receive the Sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist. The one hundred year interval for the Jubilee, decreed by Boniface

VIII, was reduced to fifty years by Clement VI (1342), to thirty-three by Urban VI (1389), and finally to twenty-five by Paul II (1470). It is now customary to extend the Jubilee the following year to all Catholics who are unable to make the journey to Rome.

The chief ceremony of the Jubilee in Rome is the breaking down and the walling up of the holy door in each of the four basilicas, which the faithful are to visit. It suggests the idea of the exclusion of Adam and Eve from Paradise, and the expulsion and reconciliation of penitents, customary in the early Church.

Bibliography: Adkins, *The Holy Year;* Thurston, *The Holy Year of Jubilee.* C. W. xxi. 258.

EXTREME UNCTION

Why do priests anoint Catholics with oil when they are dying? Does not St. James in his Epistle (v. 14, 15) refer to the miraculous power of healing in the early Church, and not to a Sacrament of Christ?

Because, as the Council of Trent teaches (Sess. xiv., ch. 1), "this Sacred Unction of the sick was instituted by Christ the Lord as a true and proper Sacrament of the New Law, insinuated indeed (*i. e.,* prefigured) in Mark vi. 13, but recommended and promulgated to the faithful by James the Apostle. 'Is any man,' he says, 'sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him' (James v. 14, 15). In which words, as the Church has learned from Apostolic tradition, received from hand to hand, he teaches the matter, the form, the proper minister, and the effect of this salutary Sacrament."

St. James' words clearly describe all the essential characteristics of a Sacrament. The anointing with oil, like the ablution in Baptism, is a visible act, while the prayer of faith said over the sick man is the form. The Apostle ascribes internal grace to the external rite, *viz.,* salvation, upraising or bodily cure, and, above all, the forgiveness of sins. The divine institution is implied in the words, "in the name of the Lord," *i. e.,* either by Christ's command, or by His power. Only God can make a visible sign bring about the forgiveness of sins.

St. James is not speaking of a miraculous gift of healing bestowed upon disciples who were not priests, but of a permanent

divine institution to be administered by a priestly ministry. Freeing one from physical evils is not "saving" him in the Gospel sense, as we learn from other passages in this same Epistle (i. 21; ii. 14; iv. 12; v. 20). Restoration of health may follow the spiritual benefits of the anointing, when, as the Council of Trent says, "it is conducive to the soul's salvation," but it is only a secondary effect of the Sacrament.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Butt, *Extreme Unction;* Galtier, *Onction et Confirmation;* Hanley, *Extreme Unction;* Kilker, *Extreme Unction;* Pohle, *The Sacraments,* iv., 1-51; De Puniet, *Onction et Confirmation;* Quinn, *Extreme Unction.* C. E. v. 716-730.—D. T. v. 1897-2022.—E. Jan., 1910; Feb., 1917.—I. T. ii. 330-345; July, 1907.

Did not the Council of Trent err in citing Mark vi. 13 as a proof of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction?

No, the Council's words are carefully chosen. It declares that the unction used by the Apostles "insinuates" the Sacrament, *i. e.,* prefigures it, as the Baptism of St. John prefigured the Baptism instituted by Christ. The anointing mentioned by St. Mark refers to bodily healing only (Matt. x. 1; Luke ix. 1, 2); it was given not only to the sick but to the blind and lame, not only to Christians but to Jews and Gentiles; it was a charismatic gift given by Christ to His Apostles to prove them His accredited ministers (Matt. x. 8), before they had been ordained priests, and before the Sacrament of Penance, of which Extreme Unction is the complement, had been instituted.

If Extreme Unction is a Sacrament, why is it never mentioned until the twelfth century?

It is not true that the Sacrament of Extreme Unction is never mentioned until the twelfth century. It is true that the early Fathers do not speak of it as often as they speak of Baptism, Penance or the Eucharist, but this can readily be understood. In the first place we have lost all but a few fragments of the commentaries on the Epistle of St. James by Clement of Alexandria, Didymus, St. Augustine and St. Cyril of Alexandria. The earliest commentary we possess dates from the eighth century, St. Bede's (735). Extreme Unction was always looked upon as a complement of Penance, and it was given in the early days, as now, just before the Viaticum. Even in our time we speak of a person receiving the Last Sacraments, without expressly mentioning Extreme Unction, and we have in every language five hundred treatises on the Eucharist compared to one on Extreme Unction. We must also take into account the doctrine of development, which declares it absurd to require the early Church to speak in the language of the Council

of Trent. The Church was content to rest upon the text of St. James, which clearly taught the sacramental efficacy of Extreme Unction, and she anointed the dying for centuries before her sacramental theology was systematized by the scholastics.

Catholic scholars have pointed out many a reference to Extreme Unction, however, in the writers of the early Church. The first witness is Origen (185-255) who speaks of it as a complement of Penance in his homily on Leviticus (ii. 43). His words declare that the remission of sin mentioned by St. James is of a similar nature to the remission of sins in the Sacrament of Penance. The sick are incapable of the "hard and laborious works" of public penance, and, therefore, God provided for them the Sacrament of Extreme Unction.

St. John Chrysostom (344-407) in his treatise on the Priesthood (iii. 6) compares the power of priests with the power of parents. "Our parents beget us unto this life, and the priests unto the other. Parents, moreover, can neither ward off bodily death from us, nor repulse impending disease. But priests often heal the soul when it is sick and about to perish, rendering milder the punishment of some and preventing others altogether from falling; and doing this not by teaching only, but by the aid of prayer. And not only when they regenerate us (Baptism) do they pardon our sins, but they also have power to forgive sins committed afterwards: for St. James says: 'Is any one sick among you,'" etc. If Extreme Unction remits sins, it is certainly a Sacrament instituted by Christ.

Pope Innocent I in a letter (416) to Decentius, Bishop of Gubbio, cites St. James, ch. v., to prove that Extreme Unction is a Sacrament on a par with Penance and the Eucharist; that it can be administered by either priests or Bishops, although the oil is to be blessed solely by the Bishop; that the Sacrament mentioned by the Apostle remits sins.

Cæsarius of Arles (503-543) in one of his sermons condemns Christians who went to magicians to be cured of their sickness, because he tells them the Church has a Sacrament that will not only heal the body, but also remit one's sins, as St. James teaches (v. 14). "He that is sick should run to the Church, and he will merit to receive health of body and pardon of his sins."

The Euchologium or Sacramentary of Serapion, Bishop of Thmuis in Egypt, was written in the first quarter of the fourth century (325). This liturgical ritual contains a prayer for the blessing of the oil of the sick, which proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Sacrament of Extreme Unction was administered then as it is to-day for the healing of the body and the remission of sins. It reads as follows: "We invoke Thee . . . Father of our Savior Jesus Christ, and we pray that Thou wilt send a healing power of the Only-Begotten from heaven upon

this oil, that it may become for those anointed . . . a casting out of every disease, an antidote against every demon . . . good grace and the remission of sins, a medicine of life and safety, health and integrity of soul, body and spirit, a perfect strengthening," etc. (*D. L.*, v., 1032). Another Eastern document of the fourth century which we possess only in a Latin translation is the Sacramentary known as the Testimony of the Lord. It also contains a prayer for the consecration of the oil of the sick, which asks God, "who art the Healer of every disease and suffering . . . to send forth upon this oil . . . the fullness of Thy kind mercy, that it may heal those who are sick, and sanctify those who return, when they approach to Thy faith" (*D. L.*, v., 1033).

In the West the Gelasian Sacramentary (735) and the Gregorian Sacramentary, which Duchesne attributes to Pope Hadrian I (772-795), although its prayers were in use in St. Gregory's time (590-604), both contain prayers for the blessing of the oil of the sick. They pray God not only "to heal all the sick person's ills, but to have mercy on all his iniquities; that he may feel Thy medicine not only in his body but also in his soul."

These liturgical documents of both East and West give us a clear proof of the Church's teaching, for the *lex orandi,* the law of prayer, is always a sure index of the *lex credendi,* the law of belief.

The first express mention of the term Extreme Unction is to be found in the statutes attributed to Sonnatius, Bishop of Rheims (600-631). One of them reads: "Extreme Unction is to be brought to the sufferer who asks for it, and the priest is in person to look after and visit him, thus animating and duly preparing him for future glory" (*D. L.*, v., 1034).

Bibliography: Duchesne, *Christian Worship;* Quinn, *Extreme Unction.* R. C. lxviii. 182; lxx. 611.

How is Extreme Unction given, and what are its effects? Is not this Sacrament apt to frighten people to death at a critical moment?

The Sacrament of Extreme Unction consists in the anointing of the sick man's eyes, ears, nose, mouth, hands and feet with olive oil blessed by the Bishop, the priest saying: "Through this holy unction and His most tender mercy, may the Lord pardon thee whatever faults thou hast committed by sight, hearing, smell, taste, touch and walking." When death is imminent, and there is no time for all the anointings, one on the forehead will suffice, with the words: "By this holy unction may the Lord pardon thee whatever faults thou hast committed." The Sacrament is given only to those who are dangerously sick,

and is never administered to soldiers going to battle, or to criminals about to be executed.

The three effects of the Sacrament are: the strengthening of the soul to bear one's sickness more patiently, and to resist the temptations of the devil; the restoring of the person's health, if that be conducive to his soul's salvation. A Sacrament of the Living, it supposes sanctifying grace in the soul which receives it. But if the sick man is unable to confess his grievous sins, and has only imperfect sorrow for them, it also forgives them.

To defer Extreme Unction until the last moment out of fear that it may frighten our sick relatives is sinful, for this Sacrament may and often does help him to recover his health. In any case it is a divine Sacrament intended for the dying, and should, if at all possible, be administered before the patient becomes unconscious. We do not hestitate to call in another doctor for consultation, even though our action may frighten the sick man. Why, then, hesitate to call in the Divine Physician, when the soul is about to enter into eternity?

HOLY ORDERS

What constitutes the Sacrament of Orders in your Church? How do you prove it a Sacrament of Christ? When was the priesthood established, and by what particular ceremony? I believe that anyone who is filled with the Apostolic spirit has the right to preach the Gospel. Does not the Bible say that every Christian is a priest?

The Council of Trent teaches: "If anyone says that Order, or Sacred Ordination, is not truly and properly a Sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord; that it is a kind of human figment devised by men unskilled in ecclesiastical matters; or that it is only a sort of rite for choosing ministers of the word of God and the Sacraments; let him be anathema" (Sess. xxiii., can. 3). "If anyone says that by these words: 'Do this for a commemoration of Me' (Luke xxii. 19) that Christ did not constitute the Apostles priests, or did not ordain that they and other priests offer His Body and Blood, let him be anathema" (Sess. xxii., can. 2).

At the Last Supper, Jesus Christ, the High Priest of the New Law according to the order of Melchisedech (Ps. cix. 4; Heb. vii. 11), instituted as a permanent and official act of worship the Eucharistic Sacrifice which He had just offered, and in commanding His Apostles to do what He Himself had done, He gave

them the power to do what He commanded; *i. e.*, to offer this self-same Sacrifice as the representatives and sharers of His Eternal Priesthood. And to complete the communication of His Priesthood to His Apostle, He added on the first Easter day the other strictly sacerdotal power of forgiving and retaining sins (Sess. xxii., can. 1).

Although most likely Christ made His Apostles priests without any special ceremony (Bellarmine, *De Sac. Ord.*, i., 2), the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. Paul mention all the elements of the Sacrament of Orders; the external symbolic rite of the imposition of hands and prayer; the internal grace given by this rite; and its institution by Christ.

The external sign is the imposition of hands. "These (the seven deacons) they set before the Apostles, and they praying, imposed hands upon them" (Acts vi. 6). "Then they, fasting and praying, and imposing their hands upon them (Paul and Barnabas), sent them away" (Acts xiii. 3). Paul and Barnabas ordain priests for the different churches. "And when they had ordained to them priests in every church, they commended them to the Lord, in whom they believed" (Acts xiv. 22). St. Paul, writing to Timothy (1 Tim. v. 22), tells us that the Sacrament of Orders was to be handed down by an external rite: "Impose not hands lightly upon any man."

That the imposition of hands communicates internal grace is taught clearly by St. Paul. "Neglect not the grace that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with imposition of the hands of the priesthood" (1 Tim. iv. 14). "I admonish thee that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of my hands" (2 Tim. i. 6).

The divine institution of Orders is also mentioned by St. Paul who says that He (Christ) "gave some Apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ" (Eph. iv. 11, 12).

No one has the right to teach the Gospel authoritatively, or carry on its sacred ministry, unless he is divinely commissioned as a successor of the Apostles, or a sharer in the Priesthood of Jesus Christ. "Neither does any man take the honor to himself, but he that is called by God, as Aaron was" (Heb. v. 4). "How can they preach," asks St. Paul, "unless they be sent?" (Rom. v. 4), *i. e.*, divinely commissioned.

The Council of Trent declares that Orders is proved to be a Sacrament "on the testimony of the Scriptures, the Apostolic tradition, and the unanimous consent of the Fathers" (Sess. xxiii., ch. 3).

There is no warrant whatever in Christian antiquity for the

notion held by some Protestants (Hatch, *The Organization of the Early Christian Church*) that the distinction between clergy and laity was based solely upon the need of maintaining good order in the Church; that the priests were mere officeholders deriving their powers from the community. From the earliest times we find mention of bishops, priests and deacons (Acts xx. 17-28; Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 2, 8, 12; v. 1, 17, 19; Tit. i. 5, 7). St. Clement (90-99) writes: "Christ is from God, and the Apostles from Christ. Preaching from city to city and throughout the country, the Apostles appointed their first converts, testing them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons for the future Christians" (Clement, *Ad. Cor.*, xliii., 2, 4). He severely rebukes the Christians of Corinth for daring "to dismiss from the ministry those who had been placed in office by the Apostles or their successors with the approval of the whole Church" (xliv., 2, 3). His rebuke was well received, for the letter of Pope Clement was placed by the Corinthians almost on a level with the Bible, and was read in the churches for nearly seventy-five years (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, iv., 23).

The Didascalia or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (290), tells the layman to honor and respect the Bishop as a father and a king; as the priest and the intermediary between God and man, whom the layman must not call to account, in order not to oppose God and give offense to the Lord" (ch. ix.).

St. Gregory of Nyssa (395) writes: "The same power of the word renders sublime and honorable the priest, who, by the newness of Ordination, has been singled out from the multitude; he who was yesterday one of the people suddenly becomes a commander, a presiding officer, a teacher of righteousness, and the dispenser of hidden mysteries" (*Orat. in Bapt. Christi*).

St. John Chrysostom (344-407) writes: "If the pledge of the Holy Spirit no longer existed, there would be no Baptism and no remission of sins . . . nor should we consume the mysteries. . . . Nor would we have priests, because, without such a descent, Orders would be impossible" (*De Ress. Mortis*, 8).

St. Augustine (354-430) places Orders on a level with the Sacrament of Baptism. "Each is a Sacrament, and each is given to man by a certain consecration: Baptism when a man is baptized, the other when he is ordained; and for this cause, in the Catholic Church, neither can be repeated" (*Contra Epis. Parmen.*, ii., 13).

It is true that St. Peter (1 Peter ii. 9), and St. John (Apoc. i. 6), call Christians priests, because at Mass they really offer up the Sacrifice with the priest and in union with him. Although the priest by Divine Ordination alone can consecrate the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of the Lord, he does so as the representative of the Christian people. The

Christian is also styled a priest because he offers up spiritual sacrifices; the sacrifice of one's body (Phil. iv. 18); of prayer (Heb. xiii. 15); of almsgiving (Heb. xiii. 16); of faith in Jesus Christ (Phil. ii. 17).

Bibliography: Bacuez, *Major Orders; Minor Orders;* Bridgett, *The Christian Priesthood;* Cronin, *The Christian Priesthood;* Pohle, *The Sacraments,* iv., 54-61; Tixeront, *Holy Orders and Ordination.*
C. E. xi. 279.

THE EPISCOPATE

Is there the slightest proof of Episcopacy in the early Church? Were not bishop and presbyter synonymous terms in the New Testament?

The Council of Trent teaches that there is in the Catholic Church a divinely instituted hierarchy of bishops, priests and deacons; that bishops are superior to priests, and have the power of confirming and ordaining (Sess. xxiii., canons 6, 7).

As Christ established the priesthood as a permanent institution, He certainly gave some priests, *i. e.,* bishops, the power to communicate the priesthood to others. The New Testament plainly tells us that the Apostles were bishops, for it pictures them frequently as ordaining—the characteristic function of a bishop.

It is true that in the New Testament the words "bishop" and "priest" are used to designate the same persons (Acts xx. 17 and 28; 1 Tim. iii. 1-7 and Tit. i. 5-9; Tit. i. 5 and i. 7). It seems certain that in the beginning all the newly-founded churches did not have at their head one bishop, having priests and deacons under his jurisdiction, as we find universally by the middle of the second century. The Apostles were not attached to any special church, and Timothy and Titus were Apostolic Delegates, placed in charge of a whole section of a country rather than bishops properly so-called (Moran, *Government of the Church in the First Century*). So churches like Ephesus (Acts xx. 17) and Philippi (Phil. i. 1) had a college of bishops at their head, subject either to an Apostle or his Delegate.

The Monarchical Episcopate of the second century was nothing new, for the mother church of Jerusalem had a Monarchical Bishop in St. James from the time the Apostles dispersed. Whether the church had one bishop at their head, or a college of several bishops, the Episcopate still carried on the Apostolic succession.

The letters of St. Ignatius of Antioch (98-117) mention the three orders of bishops, priests and deacons, while they bring

out clearly the divine origin of the Episcopate, and its superiority over the priesthood (*Ad Magnes.*, 6; *Ad Trall.*, 2, 3, 6; *Ad Eph.*, iii., 6; *Ad Phil.*, 4). The bishop is the center of the Church's unity, and concentrates in his hands all religious powers. "Without him there is no Baptism, no Eucharist and no agape. The college of presbyters adhere to the bishop as the strings to a lyre (*Ad Eph.*, iv., 1). Where the bishop is, there let the multitude (of believers) be; even as where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church" (*Ad Smyr.*, viii., 2).

Hegissippus (Eusebius, *Hist Eccles.*, iv., 22) wrote a polemical treatise against the Gnostics of his day (190), setting forth the evidence of ecclesiastical tradition, and emphasizing its close dependence on the uninterrupted succession of the bishops. St. Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.*, iii., 3) traces the Roman line back to St. Peter and St. Paul, while Dionysius of Corinth traces the bishops of Athens back to St. Dionysius.

Bibliography: Ermoni, *Les Origines de l'Episcopate* A. Q. 1892, 543.—C. W. xlix. 61.—D. L. v. 202-238.—D. T. v. 1655-1701.—R. Q. lxxviii. 337.

Why did Pope Leo XIII declare Anglican Orders null and void? Did not Catholics for years falsely state that Archbishop Parker had been consecrated in the Nag's Head Tavern by an evidently inadequate rite?

Pope Leo XIII declared in his *Apostolicæ Curæ*, September 13, 1896, that "Ordinations carried out according to the Anglican rite have been and are absolutely null and utterly void." His condemnation rests on the theological, not historical, grounds: the inherent defect of *form* in the Edwardine Ordinal used in the consecration of Parker in 1559; and the defect of *intention* in those using it.

The Pope writes: "The words which until recently were commonly held by Anglicans to constitute the proper form of priestly ordination—namely, 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' certainly do not in the least definitely express the sacred Order of priesthood, or its grace and power, which is chiefly the power 'of consecrating the offering, the true Body and Blood of the Lord,' in that Sacrifice which is no 'nude commemoration of the sacrifice offered on the Cross' (Council of Trent, Sess. xxiii., can. 1; xxii., can. 3). This form had indeed afterwards added to it (in 1662) the words 'for the office and work of a priest,' etc.; but this rather shows that the Anglicans themselves perceived that the first form (1552) was defective and inadequate. But even if this addition could give to the form its due signification, it was introduced too late, as a century had already elapsed since the adoption of the Edwardine Ordinal, for, as the hierarchy

had become extinct, there remained no power of ordaining. In vain has help been recently sought for the plea of the validity of Orders from the other prayers of the same Ordinal. For, to put aside other reasons which show this to be insufficient for the purpose in the Anglican rite, let this argument suffice for all: from them has been deliberately removed whatever sets forth the dignity and office of the priesthood in the Catholic rite. That form, therefore, cannot be considered apt or sufficient for the Sacrament, which omits what it ought essentially to signify."

"The same holds good of Episcopal consecration. For to the formula 'Receive the Holy Ghost' not only were the words for the office and work of a bishop,' etc., added at a later period (1662), but even these must be understood in a sense different from that which they bear in the Catholic rite. . . . The Episcopate undoubtedly by the institution of Christ most truly belongs to the Sacrament of Orders, and constitutes the *sacerdotium* in the highest degree. . . . So it comes to pass that, as the Sacrament of Orders and the true *sacerdotium* of Christ were utterly eliminated from the Anglican rite, and hence the *sacerdotium* is in no wise conferred truly and validly in the Episcopal consecration of the same rite, for the like reason, therefore, the Episcopate can in nowise be truly and validly conferred by it; and this is the more so because among the first duties of the Episcopate is that of ordaining ministers for the Holy Eucharist and Sacrifice."

With regard to the defect of intention, the Pope continues: "The Church does not judge about the mind and intention, in so far as it is something by its nature internal; but in so far as it is manifested externally, she is bound to judge concerning it. When anyone has rightly and seriously made use of the due form and the matter requisite for effecting and conferring a Sacrament, he is considered by the very fact to do what the Church does. On this principle rests the doctrine that a Sacrament is truly conferred by the ministry of one who is a heretic or unbaptized, provided the Catholic rite is employed. On the other hand, if the rite be changed, with the manifest intention of introducing another rite not approved by the Church, and of rejecting what the Church does, and what by the institution of Christ belongs to the nature of the Sacrament, then it is clear that not only is the necessary intention wanting to the Sacrament, but that the intention is adverse and destructive of the Sacrament."

Pope Leo also calls attention to the fact that his predecessors, Popes Julius III and Paul IV, gave an identical decision regarding the invalidity of Anglican Orders, when the case came up during the reign of Mary Tudor, and that for more than three

centuries the Catholic Church has always ordained absolutely all convert Anglican ministers. He adds: "Since in the Church it has ever been a constant and established rule that it is sacrilegious to repeat the Sacrament of Orders, it never could have come to pass that the Apostolic See would have silently acquiesced and tolerated such a custom. But not only did the Apostolic See tolerate this practice, but it approved and sanctioned it, as often as any particular case arose which called for its judgment in the matter."

The fable of the Nag's Head Tavern consecration, which no one believes to-day, most likely originated in the fertile brain of some humorous controversialist, who was piqued at the long, mysterious silence in official circles regarding the facts of Parker's consecration. When people are bitter from persecution and tyranny, they are apt to believe anything, no matter how absurd, if it counts against their opponents.

To this day, as Father Barnes proves in his *Bishop Barlow and Anglican Orders,* it is not certain that Barlow, the consecrator of Parker, was ever consecrated a bishop. This would make the Orders derived from him at least doubtful.

There is no doubt that the eliminating of all mention of the priesthood in the Edwardine Ordinal was part of that general Protestant movement, which led to the destruction of altars throughout England and the substitution of communion tables, "to move the people," as Ridley put it, "from the superstitious opinions of the Popish Mass." To this day many an Anglican bishop expressly states that he has no intention to make a Mass-priest when he ordains.

Bibliography: Barnes, *Bishop Barlow and Anglican Orders; The Popes and the Ordinal;* Boudinhon, *Sur les Ordinations Anglicanes;* Estcourt, *Anglican Ordinations;* Gasquet, *Anglican Ordinations,* Gasquet-Bishop, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer;* Kinsman, *Salve Mater;* Maturin, *The Price of Unity;* Semple, *Anglican Ordinations;* Smith, *The Bull on Anglican Orders.* A. Q. 1896, 1; 1898, 133; 1896, 674.—C. E. i. 491-498.—C. W. xvii. 856; xix. 467, 610; lxiii. 674, 812; lxvii. 367; xc. 64.—D. Jan., 1896; Oct., 1893; July, 1922.—D. A. iii. 1185-1228.—E. July, 1895; April, 1897.—M. April, 1912; July, 1922.—T. February to December, 1895.

WOMEN IN CHURCH

Why are not women ordained in your Church as well as men? Were not deaconesses ordained in the primitive church?

Because such Ordinations are contrary to the will of God, as manifested in both the Old Law and the New. Our Lord selected twelve men as His Apostles, and they in turn selected

men as their successors. St. Paul excluded women from all share in liturgical functions, forbidding them to teach (1 Tim. ii. 12) or even to address the assembled faithful (1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35).

The deaconesses of the early Church were specially blessed, but they were never ordained, as St. Epiphanius (315-403) expressly states (*Hær.*, 79, 3). They maintained order in church among the women, instructed them in the faith as many Sisters do to-day, and attended them at Baptism, which in primitive times was administered by immersion. They ceased to exist by the eighth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. E. iv. 651.—D. L. iv. 685-703.

THE TITLE "FATHER"

Why do Catholics call their priests "Father," when Christ said: "Call no man your father upon the earth; for one is your Father who is in heaven" (Matt. xxiii. 9)?

Catholics call their priests Father, because the priest is the ordinary minister of Baptism, which gives them the new birth of supernatural grace (John iii. 5).

Christ was not finding fault with the use of the terms "Rabbi" or "Father" in themselves, but was teaching us that God alone, the Father of us all, is the Source of all authority, and at the same time rebuking the Pharisees for their indomitable pride (Matt. xxiii. 2-10). It is absurd to interpret our Lord's words literally, for we have a perfect right to call our fathers and teachers by their just title. The early Christians never interpreted these words literally, for St. Paul calls Timothy his son (Phil. ii. 22; 1 Tim. i. 2), and he calls himself the spiritual father of those whom he had converted. "For if you have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet not many fathers For in Christ Jesus, by the Gospel, I have begotten you" (1 Cor. iv. 15; *Cf.* 1 John ii. 13). St. Jerome tells us that the fourth century monks in Palestine and Egypt called one another "Father."

CLERICAL CELIBACY

Why are Catholic priests forbidden to marry? Is there any Biblical warrant for clerical celibacy as a dogma of the Gospel? Were not the priests of the primitive Church married? How long has celibacy been enforced in your Church? Are not the Eastern priests allowed to marry?

Clerical celibacy is not a precept of the divine or natural law; neither is it a dogma of the Catholic Church. It is simply an obligatory law of the Western Church, imposed with a view to the dignity and duties of the priesthood.

Jesus Christ, "the Prince of Virgins" as Bishop Methodius of Olympus called Him (*Convivium*, x., 3), praises the state of virginity most highly. He says: "All men take not this word, but they to whom it is given . . . there are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. xix. 11-13).

Our Savior was restoring marriage to its primitive purity, and prohibiting divorce even in case of adultery (Matt. xix. 6). When the disciples found this teaching too strict, and objected, saying that if divorce were forbidden, it were better not to marry at all, Jesus took occasion of their remonstrance to set forth clearly the counsel of celibacy for the kingdom of heaven. The prohibition of divorce is a divine commandment for all Christians; the practice of celibacy is a divine counsel for the élite few. Our Savior's words mark the beginning of asceticism, for virginity is its essential element. Asceticism is possible even when the other practices of poverty, obedience and mortification are absent; without virginity it does not and it cannot exist.

St. Paul himself led a life of celibacy and recommended it, as our Savior had done, to all who felt called to the virgin life. "I would that all men were even as myself; but every one has his proper gift from God; one after this manner, and another after that. But I say to the unmarried and the widows. It is good for them if they so continue, even as I" (1 Cor. vii. 7, 8).

The Apostle expressly teaches, however, that there is no commandment of the Lord, either to marry or to lead a life of celibacy. Both were to be the free choice of the Christian. "Concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord, but I give counsel . . . Art thou bound to a wife? Seek not to be loosed. Art thou loosed from a wife? Seek not a wife. But if thou take a wife, thou hast not sinned, and if a virgin marry, she hath not sinned" (*Ibid.*, 25-28).

Virginity, he adds, is preferable to marriage as a higher state. It enables a Christian to serve God better, and to be "holy in body and in spirit." "He that is without a wife is solicitous for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please God. But he that is with a wife is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife; and he is divided" (*Ibid.*, 32, 33).

St. John in the Apocalypse speaks with the greatest enthusiasm of the state of virginity. "They sang as it were a new canticle. . . . These are they who were not defiled with women,

for they are virgins. These follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth. These were purchased from among men, the first fruits to God and to the Lamb. And in their mouth was found no lie: for they are without spot before the throne of God" (Apoc. xiv. 3-5).

Voluntary celibacy was commonly practiced by the faithful as early as the second century both in the East and in the West: in Syria, Asia Minor, Greece and Rome (Conway, *Studies in Church History,* 1-31). Wherever Christianity spread, thousands of generous souls spontaneously followed not merely the commandments of the Lord, but the three evangelical counsels of poverty, chastity and obedience.

St. Ignatius on his road to martyrdom at Rome sends greetings to the virgins of Smyrna (*Ad Smyr.,* xiii., 1). Even at this early date (115) virginity was recognized as a permanent state, and was highly honored by the Christian people. So much so, indeed, that some of these ascetics began to think themselves superior to their Bishop. St. Ignatius, in another letter, warns them against this false pride (*Ad Polyc.,* v., 2). The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (100) mentions the prophets as models of virginity and continence (xi., 12). Hermas in his Shepherd (160) tells us that his wife was a sister to him, and that his continence had gained for him the grace of God (*Vis.,* i., 2-4; *Mand.,* iv., 4).

St. Justin Martyr (165), after painting a vivid picture of pagan immorality, says: "When we marry, we marry to bring forth children. When we renounce marriage, we are perfectly continent" (1 *Apol.,* 29). In two other passages he speaks of the great number of Christians who are practicing celibacy (xiv., 2; xv., 6). Tatian (120-200), another early apologist, calls especial attention to the purity of the Christian ascetics—"whose bodies are spotless by a perpetual virginity; who live a celibate life for the sole purpose of uniting themselves more intimately with God" (*Orat. ad Græcos.,* 33).

If thousands of these early Christians voluntarily practiced celibacy "for the kingdom of God," in imitation of Christ and His Virgin Mother, was it not imperative that their leaders—bishops, priests and deacons—should themselves give an example of perfect Christian asceticism?

As a matter of fact, many of the clergy in the first three centuries did observe celibacy, although at that time no law of the Church enforced it. Tertullian (200), in order to deter a widow from a second marriage, reminds her of the number of those in sacred Orders who had embraced continence, and had chosen God for their spouse (*De Exh. Cast.,* xiii.). Origen (185-255) commenting on the divergent lists of priestly vestments in Exodus xxxix. and Leviticus viii., remarks that the priests of

the Old Law were pledged to continence only during the time of their service in the temple. The New Law knows no such limitation. He then contrasts the spiritual fatherhood of the Christian priests with the natural fatherhood of the Jewish priests (*In Lev.*, vi., 6).

In the fourth century the celibacy of the clergy is mentioned by Eusebius (*Dem. Evang.*, i., 9; 260-340), St. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat.*, xii., 25; 315-386), St. Jerome (*Ad Vig.*, ii.; 340-420), and St. Epiphanius (*Adv. Hær.*, lix., 4; 315-493). They tell us that it was commonly practiced in the East, in Egypt and in Rome; that it was held in high honor by the Church; that it enabled the clergy to devote themselves wholeheartedly to their sacred ministry.

It is true that married men were sometimes ordained priests, because no law to the contrary as yet existed. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.*, iii., 12; 150-216) mentions married priests and deacons, and the historian Socrates (*Hist. Eccles.*, v., 22; 440) speaks of a married episcopate in the Eastern Churches. However, he adds that in Thessaly, Macedonia and Greece priests were deposed from their ministry, if they continued to live with their wives.

The earliest law enforcing celibacy was passed by the Council of Elvira (Canon 33) in Spain about the year 300. Bishops, priests and deacons were to be deposed, if they lived with their wives and begot children after their ordination. A similar decree was enacted by a Roman Council under Pope Siricius (384-399), who wrote letters to Spain and Africa insisting upon its observance. A few years later Pope Innocent I (402-417) wrote similar letters to Bishops Victricius of Rouen and Exuperius of Toulouse. By the time of Leo the Great (440-461) the law of clerical celibacy was obligatory throughout the West.

The Eastern Churches followed a less strict line of development. The Council of Ancyra (Canon 10) in Galatia (314) permitted deacons to marry, if before their ordination they declared their intention of not leading a life of celibacy. The Council of Neo-Cæsarea (Canon 7) in Cappadocia (315) forbade priests to contract a new marriage under penalty of deposition. The Council of Nice (325) refrained from passing any law of celibacy (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.*, i., 8), but forbade the clergy to have in their houses any woman who might excite suspicion about their morals; mothers, sisters and other relatives were excepted (Canon 3). The Apostolic Constitutions (400) forbade bishops, priests and deacons to marry after their ordination, but permitted them to keep their wives. The sixth canon indeed forbade bishops and priests to put away their wives "under pretext of piety."

The custom of insisting upon a celibate episcopate in the

East (*Ibid.*, v., 22) became a law under the Emperor Justinian (527-565). The custom also of allowing priests and deacons to live with the wives they had married before ordination became general about the middle of the seventh century, and was solemnly sanctioned by the Council of Trullo in 692.

This law with some slight modifications still holds good in the Eastern Churches to-day, whether uniate or schismatic. The Russian and Armenian schismatics, as a general rule, insist upon marriage as a condition of ordination to the secular priesthood, while their Bishops are chosen for the most part from the celibate monastic clergy. Second marriages are forbidden to priests. The Nestorians alone allow priests and deacons to marry after Ordination.

Bibliography: C. W. cxii. 79.—D. L. ii. 2802-2832.—D. T. ii. 2068.—R. C. xxiv. 95; xxviii. 424.

Is not celibacy impossible, as the history of Confession down the ages amply proves? Is not celibacy against human nature? I think priests ought to marry, because the father develops a finer and kindlier nature, and by his personal experience can teach religion with greater force.

Celibacy is not impossible, and the history of Western Christendom bears witness that it has been kept by an overwhelming majority of priests. Writers like H. C. Lea, of Philadelphia, and G. G. Coulton, of Cambridge, England, take special delight in gathering together the scandals of past ages, in order to prove that celibacy is an impossible burden upon the Catholic priesthood. Their inaccuracy and unfairness have often been pointed out by Catholic scholars such as Gasquet and Thurston, but their anti-Catholic prejudice prevents their being honest in their estimates. Selecting certain periods of history when clerical morality was at a low ebb, they illogically endeavor to prove that the law of celibacy has always been inoperative.

But even in the lawless period that followed the break-up of the Empire of Charlemagne, the Church always held aloft the high standard of clerical celibacy, and denounced most vehemently clerics who were faithless to their vows. When concubinage had become widespread on the continent, God raised up holy and energetic Popes to combat the immorality of the unworthy bishops intruded into German, French and Italian sees, and the unworthy clergy who served under them. Leo X (1049-1054), St. Gregory VII (1073-1085), Urban II (1088-1099), and Calixtus II (1119-1124), made a determined fight against clerical concubinage, and the reform they inaugurated was permanent. The decree of the First Lateran Council (1123),

which declared the marriages of all in sacred Orders invalid was the high water mark of the law of celibacy in the West. Laxity of observance at certain periods will, of course, be admitted by any candid historian, but no one who knows the facts can deny that the law of celibacy has been faithfully observed from the fourth century by the vast majority of the clergy of the West.

The statement that celibacy is impossible and against human nature was voiced strongly by the worldly feudal prince-bishops in the time of Gregory VII, just as it was by Martin Luther and his apostate clerical friends in the sixteenth century. Luther's sermon on Marriage (Grisar, *Luther,* iii., 242) was certainly the utterance of a man lost to all sense of decency.

Celibacy is not impossible, for the grace of God is given abundantly to all His priests to keep them chaste. Daily Mass, the recitation of the divine Office, the frequent meditation on divine truths, the consolations of the confessional, the intimate contact with the sick and dying—all these are aids to keep every priest faithful to his vow. He is not chosen lightly for his sacred office, but is watched over for years by intelligent and pious seminary professors, who, only after a most careful judgment, declare him worthy of the sacred ministry.

A little common sense is all that is needed to answer the charge that celibacy is impossible. Would you dare say that all unmarried people find it impossible to be chaste? Are your own unmarried children, sisters, widowed cousins, maiden aunts and bachelor uncles all impure? Are all husbands, who for certain reasons are separated for a long period from their wives, bound to commit adultery? To claim that celibacy is impossible is a libel on the purity of thousands of men and women. Impure men make the statement because they rashly judge others by their own wicked lives. Good people believe this calumny out of inbred prejudice.

Some declare that celibacy is against nature. They are right, if by nature they mean the corrupt and sensual inclinations of man's lower nature, which, as St. Paul says, is continually fighting "against the law of the mind" (Rom. vii. 23). They are wrong, if they mean that all men must marry to be pure. There are thousands of pure men and women, who remain celibate out of mere natural affection for their own flesh and blood. Frequently there is nothing supernatural in their sacrifice. We have known men who have remained unmarried merely to satisfy their mother's strongly expressed—though utterly selfish—desire. We have known women who have joyfully taken a dead mother's place to provide for a large family of younger brothers and sisters. Can you honestly call their unselfishness and devotion unnatural?

If it were unnatural, why is it that virginity has been ad-

mired and practiced for ages, even among pagan nations? Greece, Rome, Gaul, Peru—all bear eloquent witness that celibacy is not against nature.

The scandals of history which some controversialists quote as an indictment against celibacy prove nothing whatever. A married clergy, whether in schismatic Russia, Lutheran Germany, or the United States, has not been free from scandals.

Practically speaking, the Catholic Church knows from long experience that a celibate clergy can do more effective work for God's people than a married clergy. An unmarried priest is freer and more independent than a minister with a wife and family. Protestants have often admitted this to me, when arguing for a celibate ministry, either in poor country parishes, or in the foreign mission field.

In view of the statistics of the law courts, it is rather futile to argue that a married man necessarily develops a finer and a kindlier nature than the celibate. The true priest is the most kindly of mortals—beloved by both young and old, rich and poor, cultured and uncultured alike. To say that a priest should marry in order to teach religion with greater efficiency is about as sensible as to order a physician to taste every drug himself, before he can prescribe correctly for his patients.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Funk, *Cölibat und Priesterehe;* Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles,* ii., 1331-1348.—D. Jan., 1925.—M. 1909, 180.

Did not God command us "to increase and multiply" (Gen. i. 23)?

God spoke these words to Adam, invoking, as the Scriptures add, a general blessing upon the human race, which was to spread everywhere by the divine institution of marriage. There is no danger of the race dying out from celibacy, for the Catholic nations who hold it in honor are the most prolific in offspring, and have the highest respect for marriage. The chief danger lies in the intentional childless marriage. The words of Genesis do not in any way imply that the man or woman who remains unmarried thereby breaks a command of God.

Was not St. Peter a married man (Matt. viii. 14; Mark i. 29; Luke iv. 38)?

If the ambiguous word *penthera* is correctly translated, St. Peter was certainly married, but he was married before he became an Apostle, and tradition declares that he did not live with his wife after his divine call (Matt. iv. 9) to the Apostleship (St. Jerome, *Epis.* 48, *Ad Pamm*). He says himself that he had left all things to follow Christ (Mark ii. 28). In his treatise against Jovinian (viii., 26) St. Jerome judges from the context of

Matt. viii. 14, 15, that St. Peter's wife must have been dead at the time of the miracle, for otherwise she would have been mentioned.

Whether St. Peter was married or not is utterly irrelevant, for clerical celibacy is not a divine law, but a Church law, dating only from the fourth century. It does not depend on precedent; it is founded on the Church's estimate of the more perfect following of Christ by her clergy.

Does not St. Paul teach: "To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife" (1 Cor. vii. 2)?

There is no warrant in these words that St. Paul commanded all to marry. Some commentators with St. Thomas believe that the Apostle is urging (not commanding, *Cf.* verses 6, 7), those to marry who had not the gift of continency. It is more probable, however, that St. Paul is not speaking of contracting marriage at all, but asking married Christians to discharge well the duties of the married state, and to avoid the sins of adultery and birth control (1 Cor. vi. 2-7). "To have a wife" never means in the Bible to take a wife. "His own" implies that she was already his wife; "have" that he should be loyal to her.

Does not St. Paul say: "It is better to marry than to burn" (1 Cor. vii. 9)?

In verses eight and nine St. Paul expressly declares that he is addressing the unmarried. He first advises them to remain unmarried, if they feel called, as he was, to follow Christ in the practice of celibacy. "I say to the unmarried, and to the widows: It is good for them if they so continue, even as I." But he immediately adds that if they are remaining unmarried in order to lead a sensual life, or if they are continually subject to carnal desires, they had better marry. "For it is better to marry than to burn," *i. e.*, with evil desires.

Does not St. Paul declare that he was married (1 Cor. ix. 5)?

No, he expressly states the contrary in 1 Cor. vii. 8. The word translated "wife" in the King James version does not mean "wife" in the original Greek, but any woman. St. Jerome in his treatise against Jovinian (i., 14) tells us that St. Paul was referring to the holy women who, according to Jewish custom, adopted by Christ Himself, accompanied their religious teacher, and ministered to his wants.

Bibliography: A. A. 1890, 697.

Does not St. Paul teach that bishops and deacons must be married men (1 Tim. iii. 2; 12; Titus i. 6)?

The words of St. Paul do not imply that all bishops and deacons *must* be married men—he himself was not—but that they were not to be ordained if twice married. Bigamy—*i. e.*, more than one marriage—is still an impediment to Holy Orders.

Does not St. Paul teach that forbidding to marry is one of the doctrines of the devil (1 Tim. iv. 1, 3)?

St. Paul in this passage is not referring to the celibacy of the priesthood. He is denouncing the Gnostic heretics of his day who condemned marriage as evil in itself, and held that men could secure a victory over matter by an unrestrained indulgence of the passions. If he were among us to-day he would condemn the celibacy of the libertine as a doctrine of the devil, but not the celibacy of the priest and sister, who are continent for the kingdom of God.

Does not your law of celibacy belittle marriage?

Not in the slightest degree. Because the Catholic Church exalts celibacy, she by no means belittles marriage. On the contrary, she regards marriage as one of the seven Sacraments instituted by Jesus Christ, a Sacrament, holy in all its relations. She strongly condemns adultery, divorce, polygamy and race suicide as essentially opposed to the Christian Gospel. Virginity is for the few, while marriage is for the many; both are holy, although in different ways. The outside churches which have ignored Christ's counsel of virginity, have at the same time degraded marriage by their denial of its sacred character, and by their pagan views of divorce and family limitation. The Catholic Church has always been loyal to the teaching of Christ: "What God has joined together let no man put asunder" (Matt. xix. 6). "Woman shall be saved through child-bearing" (1 Tim. ii. 16). "They have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven. He that can take, let him take it" (Matt. xix. 12).

RELIGIOUS ORDERS

I do not find religious orders mentioned in the Bible? Are they essential to Christianity? Why should so many Catholics retire from the world and live a cloistered life, refusing to bear their burdens of the world's responsibilities, when Christ said: "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works" (Matt. v. 16)?

There is indeed no mention of religious orders in the Bible, but the ideas and principles that prompted their founding are

clearly set forth in the life and teaching of Christ, whom they endeavor to follow in the way of perfection. While the vast majority of Christians are content to keep the Ten Commandments, there will always be an élite few in the true Church who will endeavor to observe the counsels of perfection which the Lord commended so highly. "Be you, therefore, perfect as also your Heavenly Father is perfect" (Matt. v. 48), said Christ, and He expressly pointed out to His followers the two special counsels of perfection, chastity and poverty. "He that can take it let him take it" (Matt. xix. 12). "If thou wilt be perfect, go sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow Me" (Matt. xix. 21; *Cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 38).

The religious orders are not essential to Christianity, for the Pope could suppress them all to-morrow, as Pope Clement XIV suppressed the Jesuits in 1773, and the Church would still exist in all her divine doctrine, law and worship. But the religious orders are the natural flower and fruit of the tree of God's planting. Men and women join them in response to a divine call, whereby they pledged themselves to strive after perfection, living under an approved rule that helps them to love God more perfectly and all men for His sake.

The text cited is irrelevant. Our Lord was simply teaching His disciples that a good Christian life gives the world the best possible proof of the truth of the Christian Gospel. The many saints of the religious orders have indeed let the light of their good works shine amid the darkness of a world of sin, and have thus glorified their Father who is in heaven.

Bibliography: Campbell, *The Jesuits;* Cuthbert, *The Capuchins;* Devas, *The Franciscans;* Goodier, *The Jesuits;* Jarrett, *The Dominicans;* McCaffrey, *The White Friars;* Reeves, *The Dominicans;* Stebbing, *The Redemptorists;* Ward, *The Passionists.*

THE VOWS OF RELIGION

Are not religious vows contrary to evangelical freedom? Are not vows a degrading slavery, men promising God something they know is impossible?

No, the vows aim at setting the soul free from everything—monies, sensuality, pride—that prevents it from following the counsels of Christ,—poverty, chastity and obedience. Luther taught that the vows were a degrading slavery in his two books on *Monastic Vows* and *The Clerical State.* His views attracted a sorry lot of wicked religious to the standard of the Reformation, but, as Father Grisar proves, they injured its cause greatly among the decent-minded (*Luther*, ii., 85, 116, 139, 169).

"Vows," writes Father Vermeersch, "do not imply any special instability in the person who makes them, but only the fickleness natural to the human will; and instead of denoting the grudging service of a slave, they imply rather the enthusiasm of a generous will, eager to give and sacrifice beyond what is necessary, and at the same time so sincere in self-knowledge, as to imitate warriors who burned their ships to cut off the possibility and even the temptation to flight. In case of a will incapable of a change, a vow would have no meaning" (*C. E.*, xv., 511).

Men and women who take vows promise nothing impossible. When Christ said to the young man of the Gospel: "If thou wilt be perfect, go sell what thou hast, and give to the poor . . . and come, follow Me" (Matt. xix. 21), He indeed asked something difficult, but nothing impossible. The grace of God is always at hand to make the pathway of spiritual freedom easy. "With God all things are possible" (Matt. xix. 26).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Doyle, *The Principles of the Religious Life;* LaFarge, *The Jesuits in Modern Times;* Gasquet, *Religio Religiosi;* Hill, *Charity and the Three Vows;* Jarrett, *The Religious Life.*

THE MEDIEVAL MONKS

Were not the monks of the Middle Ages a lazy, ignorant and immoral set of men?

They were not. The old time calumnies of the Reformation are no longer believed by reputable and critical non-Catholic historians. A large volume could be filled with testimonies of non-Catholics, who bear eloquent testimony to monasticism's splendid contribution to civilization.

Maitland speaks of the medieval monasteries "as quiet and religious refuges for helpless infancy and old age, shelters of respectable sympathy for the orphan maiden and the desolate widow; as central points whence agriculture was to spread over bleak hills and barren downs and marshy plains, and deal bread to millions perishing with hunger and its pestilential train; as repositories of the learning which then was, and well-springs of the learning which was to be; as nurseries of art and science, giving the stimulus, the means and the reward to invention, and aggregating around them every head that could devise and every hand that could execute; as the nucleus of the city, which in after days of pride should crown its palaces and bulwarks with the towering cross of its cathedral. This, I think, no man can deny" (*The Dark Ages*, 2).

Goodell has only praise for the Anglo-Saxon monks as farmers: "They were the true fathers of English agriculture. . . Owing to their intelligence and industry, England in the eleventh century could boast that its agriculture was far in advance of the majority of the countries of Europe. . . . When they perished, they left a void which generations have not filled" (*The Influence of the Monks in Agriculture,* 20, 22).

The medieval monks reclaimed millions of acres of desert and marsh land in every country of Europe; they copied thousands of manuscripts of the Bible, the early Fathers, the Greek and Latin classics; they founded many famous schools—Lerins, Marmoutier, Tours, Clonard, Clonmacnois, Bangor, Fulda, St. Gall, Reichenau, Jarrow, Wearmouth and York; they gathered together valuable libraries; they practiced every possible form of charity towards the poor, the sick, the leper, the prisoner; they won to the Church by their missionary labors England, Ireland, Scotland, France, Germany, Flanders, and the greater part of Italy. Our Lord told us to judge a tree by its fruits (Matt. vii. 17).

It of course happened at times that monasteries declined in fervor, especially when kings and nobles put their unworthy favorites in charge, but the Popes and the Bishops were ever on the alert, and reform, often inaugurated by a saint, soon became the order of the day. Civilization owes the monks a debt it never can repay.

Bibliography: Allies, *The Monastic Life; Monasticism, Ancient and Modern;* Butler, *Benedictine Monachism;* Destrée, *The Benedictines;* Feasey, *Monasticism;* Luddy, *The Life and Teaching of St. Bernard;* Newman, *Historical Sketches;* Montalembert, *The Monks of the West;* O'Connor, *Monasticism and Civilization;* Putnam, *Books and Their Makers in the Middle Ages;* Shahan, *The Middle Ages.* A. Q. 1886, 597.—C. W. cxvii. 477; lxxxviii. 90.—R. E. viii. 1-49.

CONVENT INSPECTION

Why are not your convents open to public inspection? Are not nuns detained in your convents against their will?

Because they are private homes. The State has the right to inspect its schools, its penitentiaries, its hospitals, and its institutions for the insane, the mentally defective, etc., in order to see that its monies are well spent, and to correct abuses that occur from time to time. It has no right whatever to invade the privacy of a man's home, unless there is grave suspicion of a crime. Convents are regularly inspected by the Bishop of the diocese, and by the superiors of the various communities. They may be

visited by anyone who is properly introduced, although at times anti-Catholic bigots like Fulton, of Boston, have abused this privilege. On one occasion he visited a House of the Good Shepherd Nuns with a priest, expressing at the time his satisfaction at the wonderful charity and kindliness of these devoted women in caring for the outcasts of their sex. Soon after he lectured in Canada, maligning the very women whose hospitality he had received. No wonder that an indignant Scotch Catholic threw him out a window of a hall in Glace Bay, Cape Breton Island, thus putting a quick end to a most filthy talk. He never came back to that section of Canada.

The convent inspection laws of some of the Southern states are based on bigotry and prejudice, and like our prohibition laws are a mere gesture, not meant to be observed. Although a dead letter, they are deeply resented by Catholics, because they reflect upon the honor of their sisters and daughters, who have given up the world to follow Christ in the more perfect way. It is hard to understand why intelligent people, no matter how prejudiced their upbringing, can accept the lying statements made about convent life by apostate priests and abandoned women, who are evidently lying for a price.

No one is obliged to enter a convent; no one is detained therein against her will. In many communities the sisters renew their vows from year to year; and even in the strictest orders the nuns may obtain a dispensation from their solemn vows, once they discover they have no vocation. Convent life is not a refuge for emotional women, disappointed in love or overwhelmed with some great sorrow, as many non-Catholics seem to think. Some of the liveliest and most attractive young women, blessed with everything this world holds dear, have given up their homes and kindred despite the bitterest opposition, to labor among the lepers in China or Japan, or to care for the abandoned children of the African natives. It is a divine vocation to spend one's life in the service of Christ's brethren; it is a mark of the true Church that she is able in every age to fill her cloistered convents with women, who, by their constant prayers and ascetic life, make up for the sins and worldliness of the outside world. If you desire to obtain a first hand knowledge of the peace and holiness which characterizes our convent life, you have only to read the history of our religious orders, and the biographies of their founders.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Buzy, *Sister Mary of Jesus Crucified; Life of Mother Cornelia Connelly;* Devas, *Mother Magdalen Taylor; Jeanne Charlotte de Bréchard; Mother Henrietta Kerr;* Herron, *The Sisters of Mercy;* Lelong, *The Nun;* Lord, *Our Nuns;* Monahan, *Madame Janet Stuart;* Scott, *Convent Life;* Ward, *Madeleine Barat; The Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur; Life of Mother Mary Aikenhead.*

THE IMMURING OF NUNS

Were not unchaste nuns walled-up alive in the Middle Ages?

No, this is a stock calumny of anti-Catholic lecturers, whose only authority is the episode introduced into Sir Walter Scott's poem, *Marmion*. Father Thurston, who has studied this matter thoroughly writes: "To anyone who honestly looks into the matter, it will be clear that no statutes of any religious order have yet been brought forward which prescribe such punishment; that no contemporary records speak of its infliction; that no attempt is made to give details of persons or time; that the few traditions that speak of the discovery of walled-up remains crumble away the moment they are examined; that the growth of the tradition itself can be abundantly accounted for; that the few historians or antiquaries of repute, whether Catholic or Protestant, either avowedly disbelieve the calumny, or studiously refrain from repeating it" (*The Myth of the Walled-up Nun*).

Bibliography: D. Jan., 1889.

Did not Henry VIII dissolve the English monasteries because of their gross immorality?

No, this was merely a pretext for confiscating their properties. The chief accusers of the English monks—Layton, Leigh, Ap Rice and London—were men whom no one could believe under oath. As the *Athenæum* remarked in a critique of Gairdner's Letters and Papers (November 27, 1886): "Seldom in the world's history has a tyrant found baser instruments for his basest designs than Henry found for carrying out the visitation of the English monasteries. That any monastery in England contained half a dozen such wretches as the more prominent visitors who came to despoil them is almost inconceivable. The reader is in danger of disbelieving everything that these men report, in his indignation at the audacious and manifest lying which characterizes their reports."

The Abbot Gasquet, who has discussed Henry VIII's robbery of the English monasteries in detail writes: "The character of the men upon whose word the monasteries have been defamed would in these days be defended by no honest historian. No other evidence is forthcoming, and it may fairly be asked, in the name of common sense no less than that of sacred justice, that the religious houses may not be condemned on the unsupported word of such miserable wretches" (*Henry VIII and the English Monasteries*, 175).

Bibliography: D. April, 1888; April, 1889.

MATRIMONY

What constitutes the Sacrament of Marriage?

The Catechism of the Council of Trent thus defines marriage: "The conjugal union of man and woman, contracted between two qualified persons, which obliges them to live together throughout life." Marriage between two unbaptized persons is a contract. In the marriage of two baptized persons the contract and the Sacrament are identical. The matter and form of the Sacrament are contained in the marriage contract itself, *i. e.*, in the consent of the man and woman, expressed externally by words and signs. The ministers of the Sacrament are the parties themselves. The priest is but the Church's official witness, before whom, and two other witnesses, all valid marriages of Catholics must be performed (Canon 1094).

Bibliography: Petrovitz, *The New Church Law on Matrimony.* A. Q. 1883, 365.—C. W. xvi. 585; xxxviii. 721; xxxix. 145.—D. T. ix. 2043-2335.

How do you prove from the Bible that Marriage is a Sacrament? Did any of the early Fathers consider it one of the Seven Sacraments?

The Council of Trent (Sess. xxix., can. 2) teaches that "Marriage is truly and properly a Sacrament of the law of the Gospel, and that it confers grace." While asserting that its sacramental character is proved chiefly by the divine tradition of the Fathers and the Councils, it declares that St. Paul "alludes" to it (innuit) in his letter to the Ephesians (v. 25-32).

St. Paul writes: "Love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church, and delivered Himself up for it, that He might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life. . . . So also ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. . . . For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh. This is a great mystery (sacramentum), but I speak in Christ and the Church."

The three essentials of a Sacrament are all expressed in these words of the Apostle: the marriage contract is an external sign, instituted by Christ to confer internal grace. Wilhelm-Scannell's *Manual of Theology* (ii., 512), thus states the argument: "The Apostle, speaking of Christian marriage, declares it to be a great sign of something sacred, namely, the union of Christ with His Church. Now, it is by sanctifying grace and by a continual influx of graces that this union takes place. A perfect representation of this union should contain something corresponding with the graces bestowed by Christ upon His Spouse—should likewise

confer upon the parties grace connected with their state. Besides, the due fulfillment of the obligations imposed upon Christian spouses requires supernatural aid."

All the early Fathers insist upon the sanctity of marriage, and St. Augustine (354-430) calls it a Sacrament in many a passage. He writes: "It is certain that not fecundity only, the fruit of which consists of offspring, nor chastity only, whose bond is fidelity, but also that a Sacrament is recommended to believers in wedlock when the Apostle says, 'Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church.' Of this Sacrament the substance undoubtedly is that the man and the woman who are joined together in wedlock, should remain inseparable as long as they live" (*De Nupt. et Concup.*, i., 10). Again: "The excellence of marriage is threefold: faithfulness, offspring, the Sacrament. In faithfulness, it is required that neither should act in violation of the marriage tie; in the offspring, that they be received in love, fed with kindness, and educated religiously; and in the Sacrament, that the marriage be not dissolved, and that neither, if divorced, be united to another, not even for the sake of offspring" (*De Gen. ad Lit.*, ix., 7, 12).

Is polygamy allowed by the Gospel as Luther and the Reformers taught, when they permitted the Landgrave of Hesse to have two wives? Was Calvin right when he condemned the polygamous marriages of the patriarchs as adulterous?

Both Luther and Calvin were heretical in their teachings on polygamy. While the original condition of marriage was monogamous, as Pope Nicholas (858-867) taught (*Ad Cons. Bulg.*), God granted a dispensation to the patriarchs, and tolerated the practice of polygamy (Deut. xxi. 15-17). The Gospel absolutely forbids polygamy, as we learn from the words of Christ and St. Paul (Matt. xix. 4-6; Rom. vii. 2; 1 Cor. vii. 2; Eph. v. 23, 31). The Council of Trent condemned the Reformers who held "that it is lawful for Christians to have several wives, and that this is prohibited by no divine law" (Sess. xxiv., can. 2). The early Fathers are unanimous in condemning polygamy.

St. Ambrose (340-397) writes: "It is not lawful for thee to take a wife while thy wife is alive. To seek another whilst thou hast thine own, is the crime of adultery" (*De Abraham*, 7).

Luther, Melanchthon and Bucer wrote the Landgrave of Hesse that the divine law gave a general sanction to polygamy, and, acting on their advice, he took a second wife, Margaret von Sale. The Reformers urged him to keep this second marriage secret for fear of scandal, and because it clearly violated the

Imperial law of the time. Bucer advised Philip, if any difficulty arose with the Emperor, to meet the problem by a downright lie. The Protestant historian, Köstlin, says of their disgraceful action: "Philip's bigamy is the greatest blot on the history of the Reformation, and remains a blot in Luther's life, despite everything that can be alleged in explanation or excuse" (Grisar, *Luther,* iv., 13-70).

Why does the Catholic Church absolutely prohibit divorce? Is it not cruel and heartless to compel a woman to live with a drunken, adulterous husband, who refuses to support her? Would it not be more reasonable to allow exceptions in certain cases, as all modern States do?

The Catholic Church prohibits divorce, because Christ prohibited it. The Council of Trent condemns those who teach that "on account of heresy, or irksome cohabitation, or the designed absence of one of the parties, the bond of matrimony may be dissolved" (Sess. xxiv., can. 5).

Our Lord's teaching that Christian marriage is indissoluble is clear. He said to the Pharisees who questioned Him about the lawfulness of divorce: "Have you not read that He who made man from the beginning made them male and female? For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they two shall be in one flesh. Therefore, now they are not two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." When the Pharisees asked Him why then did Moses allow divorce, Christ answered that the Mosaic bill of divorce was contrary to the primitive law of indissolubility, and was granted only "by reason of the hardness of your heart" (Matt. xix. 4-8).

The same teaching may be found in the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke. Christ says that the husband and wife who remarry after divorce both commit adultery, and a third party marrying the repudiated wife also commits adultery. "Whosoever shall put away his wife, committeth adultery against her. And if the wife shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery" (Mark x. 11, 12). "And he that marrieth her that is put away, committeth adultery" (Luke xvi. 18).

St. Paul compares Christian marriage to the indissoluble union of Christ with His Church (Eph. v. 24), and expressly states that death alone can dissolve the marriage bond. "For the woman that hath an husband, whilst her husband liveth is bound to the law; but if her husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. Therefore, whilst her husband

liveth, she shall be called an adulteress if she be with another man; but if her husband be dead, she is delivered from the law of her husband, so that she is not an adulteress, if she be with another man" (Rom. vii. 2, 3). "To them that are married, not I, but the Lord commandeth, that the wife depart not from her husband. And if she depart, that she remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband" (1 Cor. vii. 10, 11).

The words of Christ and St. Paul are most clear. They stigmatize the remarriage of either husband or wife with a third person as adultery (Matt. x. 11; Luke xvi. 18); they declare that if a just cause for separation exists, the parties must remain single or become reconciled (1 Cor. vii. 10); they assert that death alone can dissolve the marriage bond (Rom. vii. 2; 1 Cor. vii. 39).

Separation from bed and board is permitted for weighty reasons, as the Council of Trent teaches (Sess. xxiv., can. 8). The Church would consider continual drunkenness or adultery weighty reasons.

The State is no guide in the matter of divorce, as St. John Chrysostom remarked over a thousand years ago. He writes: "Do not cite the civil law made by outsiders, which command that a bill be issued and a divorce granted. For it is not according to these laws that the Lord will judge thee on the Last Day, but according to those which He Himself has given" (*De Lib. Rep.*). The Church recognizes that the State can legislate with regard to the civil effects of marriage, *i. e.*, make laws fixing the dowry, the right of succession, alimony, etc., but she claims, as guardian of the Sacraments, the sole right of declaring whether a marriage is valid or not.

Did not Christ Himself allow divorce in case of adultery (Matt. v. 32; xix. 9)?

No, He made no exception whatever. Matt. v. 32 reads: "But I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, excepting for the case of fornication, maketh her to commit adultery; and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery."

"The Jews had interpreted the Mosaic ordinance in the sense that a man's duty towards his wife is fulfilled when he has given her a bill of divorce. He was then free to marry again. Our Lord says: No; a man's duty to his wife is not thereby fulfilled; he is responsible for the adultery which his wife may commit, if he dismisses her for any other reason than fornication. The phrase 'maketh her to commit adultery' can only be understood on the supposition that the point at issue here is not the rights and liberties of the injured husband whose wife has committed adultery, but rather the responsibility which

the husband who dismisses his wife contracts, in case she afterwards becomes an adulteress. She is not an adulteress before her dismissal, otherwise the phrase 'maketh her to commit adultery'—would have no meaning. And lest the bond of marriage should be thought to be dissolved when the wife is put away, our Lord lays it down that he who marries the woman that is put away commits adultery" (Mahon, *The Church and Divorce,* 22).

Matthew xix. 9 reads as follows: "And I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery."

Christ is not allowing in this passage remarriage in case of adultery, as some non-Catholics have maintained, but is simply declaring that one has the right to separate from the adulterous partner. He had just restored marriage to its primitive perfection, emphasizing the fact that "what God had joined together no man can put asunder." If He had sanctioned divorce, He would have plainly contradicted what He had just said. It is a common rule of Biblical interpretation to judge a doubtful passage like this by the many clear texts which declare divorce absolutely forbidden (Mark x. 11, 12; Luke xvi. 18; 1 Cor. vii. 39).

The early Fathers are unanimous in teaching that adultery is never a ground for divorce.

Hermas (160) writes: "If a man have an adulterous wife, let him put her away, and let the husband remain by himself. But if he put his wife away and marry another, he also commits adultery himself (*Mand.,* iv., 4).

St. Justin Martyr (165) writes: "Whoever marries a woman that has been put away by another, commits adultery" (1 *Apol.,* i., 15).

St. Clement of Alexandria (150-216) writes: "The Bible declares it to be adultery, if a person marries another while his or her partner is still alive" (*Strom.,* ii., 23).

St. Jerome (340-420) writes: "As long as the husband is alive, even though he be an adulterer . . . and is deserted by his wife for his crimes, he is still her husband, and she may not take another. . . . Whether she puts her husband away, or is put away by her husband, whosoever shall take her is an adulterer" (*Epis.* 55).

St. Augustine (354-430) wrote his *De Conjugis Adulterinis* in answer to Polentius who held that adultery justified divorce. "Not so," answers the saint, who quotes Mark x. 11, 12 and Luke xvi. 18 to prove that our Lord absolutely condemned divorce.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Ayrinhac, *Marriage Legislation in the New Code;* Chesterton, *The Superstition of Divorce;* Devine, *The Law of Christian Marriage;* Day, *Marriage, Divorce and Morality;* Esmein, *Le Mariage en Droit Canonique;* Gigot, *Christ's Teaching Concerning Divorce;* D'Hulst, *The Christian Family;* Mahon, *The Church and Divorce;* Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul;* Slater, *Manual of Moral Theology;* Thurston, *Catholics and Divorce.* C. G. April, 1922.—C. W. v. 567, 684; xxxi. 550; xlviii. 33, 822; lxx. 527; lxxviii. 92; lxxx. 767; xci. 577.—D. L. iv. 1455-1478.—T. May, 1921.

THE PAULINE PRIVILEGE

Does not St. Paul permit divorce among Christians (1 Cor. vii. 12-15)?

In this passage, St. Paul is not discussing Christian marriage, but the natural marriage of the unbaptized. He plainly teaches that a marriage between two unbaptized persons may be dissolved, if husband or wife is converted to the faith, while the unbaptized party refuses to live with the convert in peaceful wedlock. He says: "If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and he consent to dwell with her, let her not put away her husband. . . . But if the unbeliever depart, let him depart. For a brother or sister is not under servitude in such cases. But God hath called us in peace."

This is known in canon law as the Pauline Privilege. Before it can be used, the convert must find out: 1. Whether the unbaptized partner is willing to receive Baptism, for in that case the marriage remains intact; 2. Whether the unbaptized party is willing to live in peaceful wedlock without blaspheming the Creator; *i. e.*, without intending to pervert or tempt the Christian to mortal sin (Pope Innocent III, 4 Decr., Tit. 19, ch. 7). If after due inquiry, technically called interpellation, these questions are answered in the negative, the Pauline Privilege may be used, and a new marriage contracted, which *ipso facto* dissolves the old. The laws governing this matter are found in canons 1120-1127 of the Code (Ayrinhac, *Marriage Legislation in the New Code,* 288-303).

Although natural marriage is in itself indissoluble, it can be dissolved by God, who permitted divorce in the Old Law and the Pauline Privilege in the New.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: De Smet, *Betrothment and Marriage.*

Why is marriage called "the Lay Sacrament?"

Because the contracting parties administer the sacrament to each other. The priest is the official representative of the Church, and the chief official witness to the Sacrament of Marriage. He

alone can carry out its solemn ceremonies, and give at Mass the nuptial blessing, which every Catholic ought, if possible, to receive. But because the contract and the Sacrament are identical, and because the matter and form of the Sacrament are contained in the contract, the priest cannot be the minister of this Sacrament.

What is a morganatic Marriage?

A morganatic Marriage is a marriage contracted between a man of royal birth and a commoner, with the express understanding that the wife and children will be content with only a certain portion of the paternal inheritance.. It is a valid Marriage like any other Marriage, differing solely in the civil effects, which involve a renunciation of the husband's rank, titles, and properties.

Why does the Catholic Church arrogantly claim the sole control over Christian marriage? By what right does the Catholic Church pretend to declare marriages valid or invalid, independently of the State?

There is no arrogance in the Church's claim. While never interfering with the State's right with regard to the civil consequences of marriage, the Catholic Church claims the entire control over Christian marriage because it is a Sacrament, and all the seven Sacraments have been divinely committed to her care. As the representative of Christ, she has the right to decide whether error, force or fraud has annulled a marriage contract; she has the right to limit the competency of certain parties to marry, *viz.*, those under age, those closely related, those in holy Orders; she has the right to safeguard her children from making unhappy marriages by her impediments of disparity of worship, of abduction and of crime.

The Council of Trent defined: "If anyone says that the Church cannot establish impediments dissolving Marriage, or that she has erred in establishing them, let him be anathema" (Sess. xxiv., can. 4). Again: "If anyone says that matrimonial causes do not belong to ecclesiastical judges, let him be anathema" (Canon 12).

From the very beginning the Church has always exercised her control over Marriage independently of the State, thus saving the faithful from the tyranny of civil, anti-Christian legislation. Instead of being actuated by arrogance and a lust for power, she has, despite the strong pressure of powerful rulers, ever kept loyal to the trust given her by her Divine Founder. Many non-Catholics, disgusted with the lax views that obtain

to-day with regard to Marriage, will heartily endorse the words of Pope Leo XIII in his Encyclical *Arcanum*.

He writes: "It must be allowed that the Catholic Church has been of the highest service to the well-being of all peoples, by her constant defence of the sanctity and perpetuity of Marriage. She deserves no small thanks for openly protesting against the civil laws which offended so grievously in this matter a century ago; for striking with anathema the Protestant heresy concerning divorce and putting away; condemning in many ways the dissolution of Marriage common among the Greeks; for declaring null and void all marriages entered into on condition of future dissolution; and lastly, for rejecting, even in the early ages, the Imperial laws in favor of divorce and putting away. And when the Roman Pontiffs withstood the most potent princes who sought with threats to obtain the Church's approval of their divorces, they fought not only for the safety of religion, but for that of civilization. Future ages will admire the courageous documents published by Nicholas I against Lothair, by Urban II and Paschal II against Philip I of France, by Celestine III and Innocent III against Philip II of France, by Clement VII and Paul III against Henry VIII, and lastly, by Pius VII against Napoleon I, in the height of his prosperity and power."

ANNULMENTS

Is it not true that while your Church *theoretically* prohibits divorce, she *practically* allows it by her system of annulments and dispensations? What difference practically is there between a divorce and an annulment? What about your Church's setting aside the marriage of the Duke of Marlborough and Miss Vanderbilt? and the marriage of Marconi and Miss O'Brien?

It is not true. The Catholic Church never grants a dispensation from the divine or the natural law, but only from a law of her own making. She never, like the modern State, declares a valid marriage null and void, but asserts by her annulment that a so-called marriage never actually took place. Is there no difference between tearing up a genuine fifty-dollar bill (The State divorce) and declaring another fifty-dollar bill a counterfeit (The Church annulment)?

For good canonical reasons the Catholic Church grants a dispensation for a man to marry his first cousin, his sister-in-law, or one unbaptized; but she never grants a dispensation for a man to marry a second woman while his first wife is living, or to marry his daughter, his sister, or one who is impotent.

The Marlborough-Vanderbilt marriage was declared null by the Church, after it had been proved conclusively that it was the result of compulsion. The law is clear: "A Marriage is invalid, if entered into because of violence or grave fear, inflicted unjustly and from without, to escape which one is forced to choose Marriage" (Canon 1087). A commentary on this law may be read in Augustine's *Commentary on the New Code*, v., 243-249). Fair minded Protestant lawyers, who have carefully considered many of the nullity trials in the *Acta Sanctæ Sedis*, have declared that "the decisions appeared fair and justified by the evidence" (Wm. Nevill Geary, *The London Times*, November 19, 1926).

The Marconi-O'Brien marriage was declared null, because both parties made its dissolubility a strict condition of their consent. The mother of Miss O'Brien refused at first to let her daughter marry, if the bond were to be considered indissoluble, for, she argued, many marriages turn out badly. Mr. Marconi made an express agreement with the mother, the daughter and the entire family, whereby he stated that either party could sue for divorce, if at any time he or she thought fit. This was in evident contradiction to the law of the Catholic Church, which states (Canon 1086, No. 2): "If either party or both by a positive act of the will exclude the marriage itself . . . or any essential property of marriage, the contract is invalid."

Controversialists often accuse the Roman Rota of giving forth annulments with lavish hand. Do they realize that in five years, this court which legislates for the whole world granted only ninety-eight decrees of nullity and refused fifty? The United States alone grants about one hundred and fifty thousand divorces a year.

ALLEGED DIVORCES OF PRINCES

Did not Pope Alexander VI grant a divorce to Lucrezia Borgia? and another divorce to Louis XII of France? Did not Pope Clement VIII grant a divorce to Henry IV of France? Did not Pope Pius VII grant a divorce to the Emperor Napoleon, and again to his brother Jerome?

No, in not one of these cases was a divorce granted by the Pope.

1. The marriage of Lucrezia Borgia to Giovanni Sforza was annulled in 1497 on the plea that it had never been consummated, as we learn from a letter of Cardinal Ascanio Sforza to Ludovico Il Moro, cited by Pastor (*History of the Popes*, v.,

520). Pastor calls this annulment "a disgraceful affair" as Sforza's testimony was forced upon him by his relatives, and Lucrezia had in view at the time her second marriage with Alfonso, the natural son of Alfonso II.

2. Louis XII's marriage with Jeanne of Valois was annulled in 1498 by a judicial commission appointed by the Pope. The King swore that the marriage had never been consummated; that he had married Jeanne only because forced to do so by her father, Louis XI; that they were related in the fourth degree of consanguinity; that there was a diriment impediment of spiritual relationship, Louis XI having been his godfather (Maulde, *Jeanne de France; Cf.* Pastor, *History of the Popes,* vi., 57).

3. The marriage of Henry IV and Marguerite de Valois was annulled by a Papal commission, composed of the Cardinal de Joyeuse, the Nuncio at Paris, and the Archbishop of Arles, because they had been married by Cardinal de Bourbon without having received the necessary dispensations from consanguinity and spiritual relationship (Henry II, her father, had been godfather of Henry of Navarre), and because Marguerite had given a forced consent, under pressure of Catherine de Médicis and her son, Charles IX (Poirson, *Histoire de Henri IV,* ii., 543).

Pope Pius VII did not grant a divorce to Jerome Bonaparte. On the contrary, he pronounced his marriage in 1803 with Miss Patterson, a Protestant girl of Baltimore, to be perfectly valid according to the laws of the Catholic Church. In a long letter in answer to the Emperor, the Pope declared that the four reasons he had advanced for nullity were irrelevant. The marriage was annulled March 21, 1805, not by the Pope, but by the French State, in order that Jerome might marry a German Princess.

5. Pope Pius VII had nothing whatever to do with the annulment of Napoleon's marriage with Josephine de Beauharnais, as it was never referred to him by Josephine or by the French ecclesiastical courts, which alone took cognizance of the case.

Napoleon was married to Josephine during the French Revolution, March 9, 1796. This civil marriage was invalid by Church law, because of the absence of the parish priest and the necessary two witnesses. (This is denied by some Canonists. *S. T.,* January, 1890.) On the eve of the Coronation, December 1, 1804, the Pope declared that he would take no part in the ceremony, unless Josephine's scruples concerning her civil marriage had been set at ease by a religious marriage. The Emperor consented, and Cardinal Fesch married them secretly without witnesses in the Tuileries, after he had obtained all the necessary dispensations from the Pope.

Five years afterwards, in 1809, Napoleon determined to di-

vorce Josephine, because she had not given him an heir. He called a family meeting at Fontainebleau, induced her to consent to a divorce, and soon after had it declared by the French Senate. His aim was to marry the Czar's sister, and, when that plan failed, to marry Marie Louise of Austria. But Catholic Austria insisted—for form's sake at least—upon the Emperor's religious marriage being annulled. Instead of appealing to the Pope, who is the ordinary judge of the marriage cases of sovereigns, Napoleon preferred to have his wishes carried out by subservient ecclesiastical courts, which he felt confident would do his bidding. Had not the Pope excommunicated him? Had not the Pope refused his request for Jerome's divorce?

He gave the matter in hand to his arch-Chancellor Cambacérès, who submitted the case to the diocesan ecclesiastical court of Paris. He placed before them sworn affidavits from Cardinal Fesch, Berthier, Duroc and Talleyrand, who testified that the marriage had been performed in the absence of the parish priest and the required two witnesses, and that Napoleon had told them that he had never given consent to the religious marriage, but went through it merely as a matter of form to satisfy the scruples of Josephine.

The diocesan court declared the marriage null, because of the absence of the parish priest and two witnesses, alleging dishonestly "the difficulty of having recourse to the Pope, to whom it has always belonged in fact to pronounce upon these extraordinary cases." Three days later, the metropolitan court pronounced the marriage null, not only on account of the absence of the parish priest, but also on the plea that the Emperor had not given consent.

Anyone who impartially weighs all the testimony, which may be studied in Welschinger's *Le Divorce de Napoleon,* will stigmatize this decree of nullity as unjust and unwarranted by the facts.

In the first place Cardinal Fesch, as he says himself, had asked the Pope for all the necessary dispensations. It is a mere quibble to state, as the Church court did, that he obtained them as Grand Almoner, and not as parish priest and witness. For the Pope knew all the facts in the case from Josephine herself, and the saintly Pontiff was not the man to consent to a mock marriage. He certainly possessed the full power to dispense from the law of the Council of Trent. We know the exact words of the Catholic ritual used on the occasion, and we know further that a marriage certificate was given to the Empress by the Cardinal.

Secondly, the diocesan court rejected the plea of non-consent as ridiculous, although the metropolitan court falsely asserted that it had agreed with its findings in the matter. No impartial

court would have considered for a moment the affidavits of such servile courtiers as Duroc, Berthier, Talleyrand, and the Emperor's uncle, Cardinal Fesch. Their affidavits are so much alike, that they bear on their face evidence of having been framed by the same hand. They knew the testimony the Emperor required of them, and they also knew that, if it were not given, they would suffer dire punishment at his hands. To what extremes this unscrupulous autocrat could go, they had learned from his cruel imprisonment of Pope Pius VII. They would soon have another example of his anger when defied, in the punishment he was to mete out to the thirteen honest "Black Cardinals," who protested against his invalid marriage with Marie Louise of Austria.

We regret that Josephine never appealed her case to Rome, as Ingeburga appealed to Celestine III against the French church courts, who had unjustly annulled her marriage with Philip Augustus.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Lyonnet, (2 vols.), *Le Cardinal Fesch;* Welschinger, *Le Divorce de Napoleon.* C. W. ii. 12.—S. T. Jan., 1890.

MIXED MARRIAGES

Why is your Church so bitterly opposed to mixed marriages? If you consider them evil, why do you allow exceptions for money? Must a non-Catholic be baptized in order to marry a Catholic? May the parties to a mixed marriage have a Catholic ceremony first, and then be married by a minister to please the parents who are non-Catholics? Why must *all* the children be brought up Catholics? Why do you not have mixed marriages in church?

The Catholic Church has prohibited mixed marriages from the earliest times, as we learn from the laws passed by the Councils of Elvira (300), Laodicea (343-389), Hippo (393) and Chalcedon (451). In modern times we find them strongly condemned by Popes Urban VIII, Clement XI, Benedict XIV, Pius IX and Leo XIII.

The chief reason for the prohibition is the danger of loss of faith on the part of the Catholic party and the children born of the marriage. Frequently a bitter unbeliever or a bigoted Protestant manifests his hatred of the Church after marriage, and by ridicule, bad example, and moral pressure of various kinds, occasions the apostasy of a weak-minded, ill-instructed or careless consort. The Catholic Church in the United States loses

thousands annually by mixed marriages. If the danger of perversion is proximate, such marriages are forbidden even by the divine law (Canon 1060).

The children of such marriages are often lost to the faith. The influence of an unbelieving non-church-going parent, especially a mother, in the open questioning of all things Catholic, will naturally prove a hindrance to the children's faith and devotion, unless it is strongly counteracted by the Catholic parent, the Catholic school, and the Church. Frequently, too, the Catholic parent dies, and the non-Catholic remarries, bringing up the children in an alien faith.

The different religious beliefs of the parents often causes discord in the home, especially when the non-Catholic is dominated by bitter, prejudiced relatives. Serious trouble too may arise from the divergent moral views on such important matters as divorce, family limitation, and the vital necessity of Catholic education for the children.

The Catholic Church never grants a dispensation unless for just and grave reasons. The non-Catholic party need not be baptized, but he must give guarantees (*cautiones*) in writing that the danger of the Catholic party's perversion will be removed. Both parties also must promise that all the children will be baptized and brought up Catholics (Canon 1061). The Church has no option in this case, for she is bound by the divine law to do all in her power to prevent her children losing the faith. The very fact that non-Catholics sign these promises so readily proves that their faith is not very sound, but merely a matter of opinion. They are for the most part indifferentists.

The canon law (Canon 1063) expressly forbids a Catholic to give or renew his matrimonial consent before a non-Catholic minister. Catholics doing so by the very fact incur excommunication, for such action is an open profession of heresy or schism. We must not sacrifice principle merely to please the unthinking, and if, the first marriage is considered binding until death, why should a sensible person go through a second meaningless ceremony? In countries that insist upon their citizens going through the formality of a civil marriage, a Catholic is bound to obey the law to insure their civil privileges. The civil marriage is then to be regarded merely as a legal formality; it has no religious significance whatever.

To show her disapproval of mixed marriages, the Catholic Church in this country forbids their being celebrated in church. They are to take place in the priest's house or the sacristy of the church. The banns are not to be published, the blessing of the ring must be omitted, and the nuptial Mass denied.

It is not true that the Church charges for dispensations The Council of Trent decreed (Sess. iv., *De Ref. Mat.*, 5) that

marriage dispensations, if granted at all, should be granted gratuitiously. The same law has been frequently promulgated by the Popes and the Sacred Congregations. All that is permitted is a small donation for chancery expenses, and the poor are expressly dispensed even from this (Canon 1056).

DISPARITY OF WORSHIP

Is a Marriage between a baptized Protestant and an infidel or unbaptized Protestant considered valid by your Church?

Under the old canon law, such a Marriage was invalid, because of the impediment of disparity of worship. Under the new canon law—*i. e.*, since May 19, 1918—this impediment has been abolished so far as non-Catholics are concerned, and such a marriage would be valid. This important change in the Church's law arose from the increasing number of unbaptized Protestants, and the consequent increase of invalid Marriages among them.

The impediment of disparity of worship now exists only between a Catholic and an unbaptized non-Catholic.

THE NE TEMERE DECREE

Is the Marriage of a Catholic valid if performed by a Protestant minister or a justice of the peace? By what right did the Pope interfere with the Marriages of Protestants in his *Ne Temere* decree of 1908?

No, a Marriage of this kind is to-day invalid. Before April 19, 1908, a marriage between a Catholic and a baptized Protestant, or, as a general rule, between two Catholics in these United States, performed by a minister or a justice of the peace, was valid, if no diriment impediment existed. The Catholic, however, committed a grievous sin, which was reserved for pardon to the Bishop. The decree of the Council of Trent, which required a Catholic to be married before a priest and two witnesses, held good in certain parts of this country; *viz.*, in the province of New Orleans, San Francisco, and Santa Fé, the dioceses of Vincennes, the city of St. Louis, and certain parishes of the dioceses of Belleville and St. Louis.

The *Ne Temere* decree of Pius X, which went into effect on Easter Sunday, April 19, 1908, declares: "Only those marriages are valid which are contracted before the parish priest or the local ordinary, or a priest delegated by either of them, and at

least two witnesses" (Canon 1904). It is not the pastor or the Bishop of the parties whose presence is necessary for the validity of the marriage, but the pastor or Bishop of the place in which the marriage takes place.

The Pope did not legislate about Protestant marriages as such. He merely laid down the law for Catholics, who by this decree are often preserved from the evil of an invalid marriage, and their children safeguarded in their faith. Why should any devout, practical Catholic be married by a mere State official or a minister, who denies the Gospel in whole or in part?

MARRIAGE OF RELATIVES

Why does the Catholic Church forbid the Marriage of blood relatives, such as first and second cousins?

The Church forbids (Canon 1076) all Marriages of blood relations in every degree of the direct line, and to the third degree inclusively of the collateral line. Her laws are intended to enforce the respect due to blood relatives, which even pagans recognized; they increase the number of one's friends, as St. Augustine said, and thus promote a more extensive bond of union among men; they prevent the birth of physically defective children.

De Smet quotes some statistics on the physical consequences of the Marriages of blood relatives. Dr. Boudin says: "The proportion of those who are deaf mutes from birth grows with the degree of the consanguinity of the parents. If, in an ordinary marriage, the danger of bringing into being a deaf-mute be represented by one, the danger is represented by eighteen in Marriages between first cousins, and by thirty-seven in Marriages between uncles and nieces" (De Smet, *Betrothment and Marriage,* ii., 103).

I recall two instances, as I write, of the marriages of first cousins. In one case the four children of the marriage were all mentally and physically defective; in the other, the three children were all normal, healthy children. "It may be," as De Smet observes, "that in the union of closely related persons the family physical defects are increased and emphasized. In union with an individual of another family, the defects proper to each are more easily neutralized in the offspring."

Bibliography: D. Jan., 1911.—I. T. April, 1919.

Why are Catholics forbidden to marry in Advent and Lent?

They are not forbidden to marry in Lent or Advent. Marriage may be contracted at any time of the year. The solemni-

ties of Marriage, *i. e.*, the solemn blessing, the ringing of bells, the playing of the organ, the use of a carpet, etc., are forbidden from the First Sunday of Advent till Christmas day inclusively, and from Ash Wednesday till Easter Sunday inclusively (Canon 1108). The Bishop, however, may permit the nuptial blessing, although he should urge the marriage couple to refrain from any excessive display during the Church's season of penance.

BIRTH CONTROL

Why is the Catholic Church so bitterly opposed to birth control? Why does your Church compel its people under sin to have large families? Is it not sinful to bring children that one cannot support into the world? Is not family limitation imperative, inasmuch as population increases more rapidly than the means of subsistence? Should not quality and not quantity be the rule in child-bearing? The modern world advocates: "Fewer children and better." What Council of the Church ever condemned birth control?

The Catholic Church condemns birth control as an unnatural and immoral vice, prohibited by the Fifth and the Sixth Commandments. While there has been no ruling upon this matter by any General Council, the Church's divine tradition from the days of the primitive Church to the latest decrees of the Roman Congregations has always been clear and unequivocal. A decree of the Holy Office, March 21, 1851, declared it forbidden by the natural law, and a second decree, April 10, 1853, declared it intrinsically evil. No standard book of Catholic ethics or moral theology ever tolerated the practice.

The marital right is not only lawful and holy, but a strict right, binding upon both parties until death, and voidable only for good reasons, such as drunkenness, insanity, grave dangers to life and health and the like. By mutual consent, however, both husband and wife may forego their rights, either permanently or for a time (1 Cor. vii. 5).

Non-Catholics frequently misunderstand our position on birth control, for they seem to believe, like our questioner, that Catholic married couples are bound to have children to the utmost capacity of the mother for child-bearing. This is not true. It is perfectly ethical to limit the family, if the method is self-control by abstinence and continence. What the Catholic Church absolutely forbids is the limitation of the family, or contraception, by chemical, mechanical or other artificial means.

Birth control is against the law of nature. It is unnatural inasmuch as it implies the frustration of the order of creation. It defeats the immediate end of a natural human act; it is against the natural instincts of humanity; it leads to excess in the use of a function, which preeminently calls for the exercise of self-control.

The immediate purpose and primary end of Marriage is the begetting of children. When the marital relation is so used as to render the fulfillment of its purpose impossible, it is used unethically and unnaturally. The pleasures of marriage are innocent in view of legitimate child-bearing; they become sinful and degrading, only when separated from the sacrifices and responsibilities of parenthood.

There is unquestionably a widespread, and almost universal sense of sin and shame, which is implanted in the race by Almighty God, in men and women, who practice birth control. True, its modern advocates laugh at these intimations of conscience, and assert they are but superstitious survivals of a discredited tradition. Catholics are loyal to the divine tradition, associated with a Sacrament of Christ, which for them places the question beyond dispute. They fully appreciate the difficulties incident to the observance of this divine law, but they have a special grace given by the Lord to face them. Her ethics have a divine foundation, and do not change with the changes born of modern unbelief.

There is no evidence whatever to prove the so-called fact of overpopulation. Indeed, the latest scientific studies prove the contrary. Although the world's population in recent decades has been rapidly increasing, the food production of the world has been increasing at a still more rapid rate. Pearl, Reed, Baker, Strong,—all agree that the United States has actual and potential food resources far in excess of its present needs. Leroy-Beaulieu thinks that the world could even triple its population without the slightest danger.

The poverty plea is easily ruled out of court, because, as a matter of fact, the poor do not practice birth control as much as the well-to-do. It is not the high rents, the cost of child-bearing, or the expenses of child-rearing that fosters contraception; it is the immorality and irreligion of the modern parent, who is eaten up with selfishness and the love of pleasure.

It is often asserted that the mother who bears many children pays the penalty in loss of health and life. We willingly grant that child-bearing is always attended with some risk, despite the fact that modern scientific progress in obstetrics has eliminated the danger in great part. But on the other hand we have statistics to prove that maternal longevity is associated with large families. While these figures do not prove that maternal longev-

ity is the result of prolific child-bearing, they do prove that the slum statistics of the advocates of birth control are utterly worthless. Not the bearing of children, but poverty, ignorance, and the lack of medical care are in most cases the real causes of disease and death.

Birth control is often advocated as beneficial to men and women, but many reputable physicians have made a large list of diseases traceable to this pagan interference with the laws of nature: sterility, fibroids, neuroses of various kinds. Dr. Mary Sharlied, for instance, writes in the *British Medical Review:* "An experience of well over forty years convinces me that the artificial limitation of the family causes damage to a woman's nervous system. . . . Such a woman is not only sterile, but nervous, and in generally poor health."

Birth control is often destructive of the peace, happiness and stability of the marriage bond. The rearing of a good-sized family cements the love of husband and wife by its many demands upon their better nature. More divorces occur when marriages are childless (Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage,* iii., 366). Divorce is surely increasing rapidly enough without our adding another factor to the steady weakening of the marriage bond.

A large family is an inestimable boon to the children thereof, teaching them self-reliance, generosity, self-discipline, and self-mastery. The one child of the modern home is likely to be a selfish and useless member of society.

No argument is more fallacious and stupid than the axiom: "Fewer children, better children." It is the normal and not the small family that gives the world the best children. The Eugenics laboratory of the University of London has statistics to prove that heredity favors the third, fourth, fifth and subsequent children rather than the first two, who are peculiarly apt to inherit some of the commonest physical and mental defects of their parents.

All this talk about the betterment of the race sounds absurd on the lips of those who are doing their utmost to destroy it. As Theodore Roosevelt once said: "The greatest of all curses is the curse of sterility, and the severest of all condemnations should be that visited upon willful sterility. The first essential in any civilization is that the man and the woman shall be the father and the mother of healthy children, so that the race shall increase and not decrease."

The declining birth rate in every country to-day should make men realize the debt the nations owe to the Catholic Church, which of all the Churches has alone remained true to the divine teaching condemnatory of birth control.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Cooper, *Birth Control;* Conway, *Birth Control;*

The Church and Eugenics; Davis, *Birth Control Ethics;* Von Helmut Fahsel, *Ehe, Liebe, und Sexual problem;* De Guchteneere, *La Limitation des Naissances;* Gerrard, *The Church and Eugenics;* Ryan, *Family Limitation;* Slater, *Questions of Moral Theology;* Sutherland, *Birth Control; Birth Control Exposed;* Thurston, *The Declining Birth Rate.* E. Nov., 1916.

THE SACRAMENTALS

What is the difference between a Sacrament and a sacramental?

The seven Sacraments were all instituted by Christ, and the Church is powerless to change them; when worthily received, they infallibly confer grace of themselves. The sacramentals are rites instituted by the Church, which can modify or abrogate them at will; they do not confer sanctifying grace of themselves, but depend for their efficacy upon the personal devotion of the faithful using them, and the intention of the Church, manifested by her official prayers.

The sacramentals may move God to give special actual graces, for the leading of a good Christian life in the married state or the clerical; *v. g.,* the nuptial blessing; the tonsure; they may protect the soul from Satan, and drive away evil spirits; *v. g.,* exorcism, holy water; they may dedicate a thing to the service of God; *v. g.,* the blessing of a church, an altar, a chalice; they may forgive venial sins by inclining the soul to penance; *v. g.,* the recital of the Lord's Prayer, the Confiteor, the sign of the Cross; they may, if it be God's will, obtain temporal favors; *v. g.,* the blessing of a private home, of the harvest.

Bibliography: Gasquet, *Sacramentals and Some Catholic Practices;* Lambing, *The Sacramentals;* Paschang, *The Sacramentals in the New Code.* C. E. xiii. 292.

CEREMONIES

Why do Catholics have so many silly and meaningless ceremonies? Was not the early worship of the Christians simple, in utter contrast to the ceremonial of the Roman Church to-day? Cannot Christians worship God without so much ceremony?

If our ceremonies appear silly and meaningless to you, it is because you do not understand their beautiful symbolism, or because you are ignorant of their origin. Not a word is said, not a gesture made, not an action performed in a Catholic church, but is intended to raise the soul to God, and to foster and increase our love for Him.

We could indeed worship God without ceremony, if we were wrecked on a desert island, far from the haunts of civilized men. Catholics were compelled to dispense with ceremony during the penal days, when Mass was said in a barn or a mountain cave despite the law of the land. That is why ritual was most simple in Apostolic days, for Mass was said in private houses, or in the Catacombs, with the constant threat of death before the eyes of the faithful. The absence of ceremonial was due to necessity, and not to choice.

Ceremony is natural to man. We are not disembodied spirits, but creatures composed of body and soul. The soul is always under the influence of the senses, which are apt to draw it away from the contemplation of the things of God. Does it not seem natural that a Church that appeals to the whole man as God's Church alone does, should make the senses aid in the awakening of spiritual ideas, and the driving away of worldly distractions?

The average man expresses outwardly what he feels interiorly. His hand-shake expresses friendship, his kiss expresses love, his blow evidences his anger. Should we not then give outward expression to our friendship and love of God, and our hatred of all things opposed to Him?

The lights on our altars recall Jesus Christ the Light of the World, and our faith in Him; the burning incense reminds us of prayer; the washing of the feet on Holy Thursday preaches to us a lesson of humility, and the ashes blessed on Ash Wednesday remind us of the hour of our death.

We show our love for our friends and kinsfolk by giving them presents on their birthdays, or at Christmas time; we honor a victorious army or a brave man flying from New York to Paris, by processions, and the giving of medals; we send flowers to our mothers or our sweethearts to prove they are not forgotten; we remember our patriots by erecting statues to them in the public squares and parks. Why should God be excepted in our public homage of love and reverence? Jesus Christ is really present upon every Catholic altar in the world. That is why Catholics build costly churches to do Him honor, and then pay Him the homage of adoration in every possible way, by enriching them with the gifts He Himself has given us—gold, silver, flowers, and the best fruits of man's genius in music, painting and sculpture.

Ceremonies are to be found in the Gospels, as well as in the Old Law, wherein they were prescribed to the minutest detail (Exod. xxvi.; xxvii.; xxviii.; Num.; Lev.). Christ *knelt* in prayer (Luke xxii. 41); He *fell flat* on the ground (Mark xiv. 35); *He raised His eyes* to heaven in giving thanks (Mark vi. 41); He cured the deaf and dumb man by "putting His finger into his

ears, and spitting He touched his tongue" (Mark vii. 33, 34); He cured the blind man, "spitting on the ground, and making a clay of the spittle" (John ix. 6); He *breathed* upon the Apostles (John xx. 22); He *blessed* the disciples when He ascended into heaven (Luke xxiv. 50). We find the Apostles anointing the sick with oil (Mark vi. 13), baptizing with water (Acts ii. 41), imposing hands in Ordination (1 Tim. iv. 14), using relics to work miracles (Acts xix. 12), and performing symbolic actions (Acts xxi. 11).

We readily grant that some Catholics may go through all the outward forms of religion while they are in a state of sin, and that others may make the sign of the Cross or genuflect in church before the Blessed Sacrament without realizing what they are doing, but it is surely unjust to accuse all Catholics of externalism and Phariseeism. Many an honest non-Catholic has testified to the devotion of the Catholic people at Mass and at Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament.

Is it not strange that the very man who objects to the ritual of the Catholic Church, will take special delight in the ritual of some secret society like the Masons, the Elks, or the Pythians? Deprived of the old time Christian ceremonies by the sixteenth century Reformers, non-Catholics to-day frame ceremonies of their own to satisfy the natural instincts of the human heart.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bonomelli, *On Religious Worship;* Bridgett, *Ritual of the New Testament;* Durand, *Catholic Ceremonies;* Fortescue, *Ceremonies of the Roman Rite.* D. T. ii. 2139-2151.

COSTLY CHURCHES

Why do Catholics spend thousands and even millions on the building of their churches, when all around them are thousands of poor people sadly in need of even the necessaries of life?—*An Unbeliever.*

Because they know that their churches are really Houses of God, where Jesus Christ is really present. If men of the world who love their wives build magnificent homes for them when they can afford it, ought not the Catholic people build beautiful dwelling places for Christ, their Lord and King?

The Jews in the Old Law were lavish with their gold and precious stones for the adorning of the Temple of Solomon (2 Par. iii., iv.), which was merely a figure of the Churches of the New Law.

The objection of our unbelieving friend is on a par with the objection of Judas Iscariot, who found fault with Mary Magdalen for wasting the precious ointment on the feet of Jesus

(John xii. 3-8). Our Lord praised her for her kindness and generosity, while St. John adds that Judas objected, "not because he cared for the poor, but because he was a thief."

The Catholic Church has always been the great lover of the poor, and the Catholic priest, ever their truest friend, as the universal love of the poor for him abundantly proves. The money spent in church building is money well spent, for it is a practical, substantial proof of the Church's love of Christ, and of the poor, who are always welcome within her sanctuary.

The modern non-churchgoer who says he can pray to God anywhere, as a matter of fact never prays at all. And the modern unbeliever is often the most hard hearted of mortals, believing with the old time pagan that it is silly to give monies in charity, for thereby you keep the poor longer in their misery.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bonomelli, *On Religious Worship,* 180.

INCENSE

Why do you burn fragrant spices during your services? What is incense?

Incense is an aromatic substance obtained from resinous trees found in Eastern tropical countries. Placed upon a burning piece of charcoal in a thurible, it gives forth a heavy smoke of a most fragrant odor. It is symbolical of a good Christian's prayer, which ascends on high to the throne of God, and is pleasing in His sight. The Psalmist sings: "Let my prayer, O Lord, be directed as incense in Thy sight" (Ps. xl. 2).

In the Old Law Moses built an altar of incense at God's command (Exod. xxxi. 9), and special Levites were put in charge of it (1 Par. ix. 29). Incense was used extensively in the Jewish ritual (Lev. vi. 15), and although not mentioned by any Christian writer until the fourth century (Egeria, *Peregrinatio,* 2), the early Church must have adopted it from the temple (Apoc. vii. 3-5).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. E. vii. 716.

CANDLES

Why do you have candles lighted on your altar in the day time? Why are candles burned before the shrines of the saints, and around the bodies of the dead?

When the heretic Vigilantius asked this same question in the fourth century, St. Jerome answered that candles were lighted while the Gospel was read, "not indeed to put darkness to flight,

but as a sign of joy" (*Ad Vigil.*, 7). St. Luke mentions "the great number of lamps" which burned in the upper chamber at Troas, when St. Paul kept preaching until midnight (Acts xx. 7, 8).

In the early Church Baptism was called "illumination," on account of the many candles lighted during the solemn baptismal ceremonies on Easter Saturday. Eusebius says of the Emperor Constantine that "he transformed the night of the sacred vigil into the brilliancy of day, by lighting throughout the whole city pillars of wax, while burning lamps illuminated every part, so that this mystic vigil was rendered brighter than the brightest daylight" (*De Vita Const.*, iv., 22). In Christian tradition the clean wax of the candle is symbolic of the pure flesh of Christ, the wick an image of the soul of Christ, and the flame a figure of the Divine Personality of the Word made Flesh, "the True Light which enlighteneth every man" (John i. 9; viii. 12).

The candles that burn before the shrines of saints are symbolical of prayer and sacrifice. In the Middle Ages it was a common practice to offer to a favorite shrine a number of candles equaling in measurement the height of the person who asked a favor from God.

The candles that burn around the dead, symbolize the faith of the Catholic, manifested before men by his good works. "So let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven" (Matt. v. 16).

THE CHURCHING OF WOMEN

What is meant by the churching of women?

The churching of women is a blessing given by the priest to Catholic women after childbirth. The rite was probably suggested by the Jewish rite of purification of women after childbirth (Lev. xii.). The contrast between the two rites is most striking, for whereas the Jewish mother was blessed to be freed from a legal defilement, the Christian mother comes before the altar to give thanks to God for her safe delivery. The ceremony consists of the recitation of Psalm xxiii., a special blessing with the sprinkling of holy water, and the beautiful prayer: "Almighty, Eternal God, who through the bringing forth of the Blessed Virgin Mary has turned the sorrows of those who bring forth into joy, look kindly upon Thy handmaid, who has come to Thy temple to give joyful thanks to Thee: and grant that after this life, through the merits and intercession of the same Blessed Virgin, she and her child may deserve to attain the joys of eternal blessedness. Through Christ our Lord."

There is no church law requiring the churching of women, but the ritual calls it "a pious and laudable custom," that goes back to the earliest days of Christianity.

THE STATIONS OF THE CROSS

What is the origin and meaning of the Stations of the Cross?

The Stations of the Cross are a series of pictures or tableaux, placed on the walls of churches, or in the open air as in the Colosseum at Rome, representing scenes in the Passion of our Lord. They may be said privately or publicly by Catholics, who go from one to another of the fourteen stations, singing hymns and reciting prayers, while they meditate on the Savior's sufferings and Death.

Pilgrimages to the Holy Land have been popular since the time of Constantine. St. Jerome mentions the crowds of pilgrims who came to Jerusalem in his day. To satisfy the devotion of Catholics, who could only make this pilgrimage in spirit, St. Petronius, in the fifth century, erected in St. Stephen's monastery at Bologna a number of chapels, modeled on the chief shrines of Jerusalem. Blessed Alvarez in the fifteenth century, on his return from the Holy Land, built a number of chapels in the Dominican friary of Cordova, on the walls of which were painted the chief scenes of the Passion.

The erection of Stations in the churches as we have them today did not become widespread until the close of the seventeenth century, when Pope Innocent XI granted special indulgences to the faithful, who would follow Christ in the Way of the Cross.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Thurston, *The Stations of the Cross;* Keppler, *Die XIV Stationen.*

CHRISTIAN MONOGRAMS

What is the meaning of the letters I. H. S.; I. N. R I.; X. P., and A. Ω., which are often seen on the priest's vestments, on altars and on the floors of churches?

I. H. S. is an abbreviation of the Greek name of Jesus Christ I. N. R. I. are the initials of the inscription placed over the cross by Pontias Pilate, meaning Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews (John xix. 19).

X. P. is a Greek monogram for Christ, composed of the first two letters of His name, *Christos.*

A. Ω. are the first and last letters of the Greek alphabet, signifying God, the Beginning and End of all things (Apoc. i. 8).

THE BREVIARY—VESPERS

What is the Breviary? What is the Vesper Service?

The Breviary is the divine office, recited publicly in choir by the religious orders, and privately by every priest under penalty of sin. It consists of the Psalter (the 150 Psalms), the office of the liturgical seasons and the saints, the common prayers for Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, Virgins, etc., and special offices like the Office of the Blessed Virgin. It is divided into seven parts, Matins, Lauds, Prime, Tierce, Sext, None, Vespers and Compline, all of which include the recitation of psalms, hymns, lessons, antiphons, and collects or prayers.

Because of its great length, and because of the early hour at which most of it was recited, it was practically impossible to say the whole office in church, so that Vespers alone became the popular portion. It consists of five psalms, a hymn, the Magnificat, and certain prayers that vary with the special feast of the day. It is a devotional service calculated to bring the faithful to church a second time after the obligatory Mass, and is in perfect accord with the practice of Apostolic Christianity, when the people were "speaking in psalms and hymns, and spiritual canticles, singing and making melody in their hearts to God" (Eph. v. 19; *Cf.* Col. iii. 16).

Bibliography: Batiffol, *The Roman Breviary;* Baudot, *The Roman Breviary;* Britt, *Hymns of the Breviary;* Bute, *Translation of the Roman Breviary,* 4 vols.; Cabrol, *Liturgical Prayer;* Duchesne, *Christian Worship.* C. E. ii. 768-777; xv. 382.—C. W. xc. 29.—D. L. iii. 1954, 1977.—R. C. vi. 92.

THE SIGN OF THE CROSS

Why do Catholics make the sign of the Cross? Is it not idolatry to "adore the Cross," as Catholics do on Good Friday?

Catholics begin their prayers and sanctify their actions by the sign of the Cross, because it is the symbol of our Redemption by Jesus Christ. They say with St. Paul: "God forbid that I should glory save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Gal. vi. 14). Catholics have used this sacred sign from the earliest times. We read in Tertullian (160-250): "In all our travels and movements, in all our coming in and going out, in putting on our clothes and shoes, at the bath, at the table, in lighting our lamps, in lying down, whatever employment occupies us, we mark our forehead with the sign of the Cross" (*De Cor. Mil.,* 3). Origen (185-255) writes: "The letter *Thau* bears a resemblance to the

figure of the Cross; and this prophecy (Ezech. ix. 4) is said to refer to the sign made by Christians on the forehead, which all believers make whatsoever work they begin, and especially at the beginning of prayers, and of holy reading" (*In Ezech.*, ix.).

If Catholics adored the mere wood of the Cross in itself, they would be guilty of idolatry. They do not. They give a reverence to the Cross as representing something else, Jesus Christ the Lord. They adore Him who died upon it for our salvation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Q. 1887, 726.—D. L. iii. 3045-3131.—D. T. iii. 2339-2363.

HOLY WATER

Why do Catholics sprinkle themselves with holy water in their homes and before entering church? Is this not a superstitious practice without warrant in the Bible?

Catholics use holy water to drive away evil spirits, and to call to mind the purity of heart with which they should come into the presence of Christ, really present upon the altar. In blessing it, the priest adds some salt to symbolize incorruption and immortality. The use of holy water is in no way a superstitious practice, because Catholics do not believe that it has any virtue in itself; its efficacy depends entirely upon the devotion of those who use it, and upon God's acceptance of the prayers of His Church. St. Paul tells us that "Every creature of God is good . . . for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer" (1 Tim. iv. 4, 5).

Reason suggested to the Greeks and Romans that water, the natural element for cleansing, was symbolical of interior purity. They used it frequently in their religious ceremonies, to bless their fields, their cities and their armies. The Jews used holy water extensively in their ritual; *v. g.*, in the ordination of priests and levites (Exod. xxix. 4; Lev. viii. 6; Num. viii. 7), before offering sacrifice (Exod. xxx. 17), in the accusation of adultery (Num. v. 17), and in the ablutions before meals and prayers (Mark vii. 13). A brazen laver for ablutions was specially blessed (Lev. viii. 11) and placed between the altar and the tabernacle (Exod. xxx. 18; xxxviii. 8; xl. 7). There were ten lavers in Solomon's Temple (3 Kings vii. 38).

The Catholic Church by the command of Christ has always used water for the Sacrament of Baptism, and by the counsel of Christ has always practiced the devotional washing of the feet on Holy Thursday (John xiii. 8). The blessing of the baptismal font is mentioned by St. Augustine (Ser. 81) and by St. Ambrose (*De Myst.*, iii., 14).

The blessing of holy water with a prayer to drive away evil spirits is found in many documents of the fourth century, such as the *Apostolic Constitutions,* the *Testament of the Lord,* and the *Pontifical of Serapion.* St. Epiphanius speaks of a miraculous cure effected by its use (*Adv. Hær.,* i., 30). In the vestibules of the churches of the fourth century were *canthari,* or large basins of water for cleansing, especially in view of the fact that the Sacred Host was placed in the right hand for Communion. "Let the hand be clean," writes St. Jerome, "that holds the Body of Christ, and the heart be pure that receives It" (*In Epis. ad Titum*). The holy water font of to-day goes back to the sixth century.

Bibliography: King, *Holy Water;* McKenna, *Holy Water.* **C. E.** vii. 432-435.—**D. L.** ii. 685-713.

ASHES

Why are ashes placed on the foreheads of Catholics on Ash Wednesday?

Ashes have always been regarded as a sign of mourning and repentance (Jonas iii. 5, 6; Job xlii. 6; Isa. lviii. 5; Jer. vi. 26; xxv. 34). The priest on Ash Wednesday places ashes on the foreheads of the faithful with the words: "Remember man that thou art dust, and unto dust thou shalt return," to remind them that they are about to enter into the penitential season of Lent This custom arose from the desire of the people to participate out of devotion in the humiliation of the public penitents of the early Church, who were dressed in sackcloth and marked with ashes, and expelled by the Bishop from Church until Holy Thursday.

Bibliography: Kellner, *Christian Festivals,* 78; Thurston, *Lent and Holy Week.* **D. B.** ii. 406.—**D. L.** ii. 3037-3044.

PALMS

Why do you bless palms in your Church the Sunday before Easter?

This ceremony recalls the triumphal entrance of Christ into Jerusalem on the first Palm Sunday (Mark xi. 8). The Spanish pilgrim, Egeria, who visited Jerusalem in 380, has given us a good description of the Palm Sunday procession. She writes: "And when after long prayers it begins to be about six o'clock, that passage in the Gospel is read aloud in which the children with branches and palms greeted our Lord, crying, 'Blessed is

He that cometh in the name of the Lord.' And straightway the Bishop rises, and all the people with him, and thence they go to the summit of Mount Olivet, the whole way on foot, the people walking before him with psalms and antiphons, and continually singing the refrain: 'Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord.' And all the children in these places, even those that cannot yet walk, are carried in the arms of their parents, all with boughs, some of olive, some of palm, and in that way they bring the Bishop to the city, just as the crowds escorted our Lord."

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Duchesne, *Christian Worship;* Kellner, *Christian Festivals;* Beck, *The Church of Our Fathers.* E. April, 1890.

BELLS

Why do you "baptize" church bells? Is this not a profanation of the Sacrament of Baptism?

We do not baptize bells, but we bless them. The so-called baptism of bells is a popular expression, never formally recognized by the Church. While there are certain superficial resemblances in the ritual used, such as the use of exorcisms, water, salt, and anointings, the giving of a name, etc., there is nothing in the wording of the ceremonies equivalent to the form of Baptism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: De Rossi, *Roma Sotteranea,* 586, 616. C. E. ii. 418-424.—D. July, 1895.—D. L. iii. 1954-1977.—E. March, 1909; March, 1910.—M. June, 1907; Nov., 1909.—R. C. xxix. 337; liv. 257.

THE AGNUS DEI

Is not the Agnus Dei a pagan charm or amulet?

On the contrary, it was most probably a Christian substitute for the pagan charms current in Rome in the fifth century.

Agnus Deis are small discs of wax, bearing on one side the imprint of a lamb bearing a cross, and on the other the arms of the Pope, or the figure of a saint. They are blessed by the Pope the first year of his pontificate, and every seventh year afterwards. The wax symbolizes the virgin flesh of Christ, and the Cross Christ's Death for our salvation. The prayers of blessing make special mention of the prevention of perils from fire, flood, storm, pestilence, and childbirth. They urge Catholics to turn to Christ in every danger, and promise that He, the Lamb of God (*Agnus Dei*), "who taketh away the sin of the world"

(John i. 29), will protect them, as of old the blood of the Paschal Lamb saved the children of Israel from the hands of the destroying angel (Exod. xii. 13).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Thurston, *The Holy Year of Jubilee.* D. T. i. 605-613.

THE SCAPULAR

Is it not a superstitious custom to wear the scapular or the scapular medal, believing it a sure charm against all evils?

Catholics do not consider the scapular a charm against evil. The small scapular of woolen cloth, or the medal which may take its place since 1910, is merely a badge of membership in a religious confraternity, associated with some religious order, like the Carmelites, the Servites, the Trinitarians, the Passionists or the Dominicans. It is modeled on the monastic scapular, which was worn over the cassock.

The faithful who wear it share in the good works of the order, gain special indulgences, and pledge themselves to be devout clients of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin and the Saints.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Maginnis, *The Scapular Devotion.* C. E. xiii. 508-514.

THE BLESSED VIRGIN

Why do you call the Virgin Mary the Mother of God instead of the Mother of Jesus? Can a human being be the Mother of the Eternal God?

Because the Sacred Scriptures plainly declare in many passages that the Blessed Virgin is the Mother of God. The angel Gabriel said to Mary: "Behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and shalt bring forth a Son and thou shalt call His name Jesus. . . . The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee. And, therefore, also the Holy that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (Luke i. 31, 35). The saintly Elizabeth greeted Mary with the words: "Whence is this to me that the Mother of my Lord shall come to me?" (Luke i. 43.) St. Paul says that "God sent His Son, made of a woman" (Gal. iv. 4; *Cf.* Rom. i. 3).

The Apostles' Creed professes: "And in Jesus Christ, His only Son our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary." This belief was so firmly accepted as divinely revealed, that the Council of Ephesus in 431 made it the standard of orthodoxy, excommunicating the Nestorian heretics who denied it.

Non-Catholics who make Mary the Mother of Jesus do so, because they do not accept the true doctrine of the Incarnation, *viz.*, that Jesus Christ possesses a Divine and a Human nature in one Divine Personality. Jesus was never a human person; He was a divine Person who assumed our human nature in the womb of the Virgin Mary. She was the Mother of the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, and therefore the Mother of God.

As our mothers are not called the mothers of our bodies, but simply our mothers, because the soul directly created by God is united with the body in a human personality, so the Blessed Virgin is not called the Mother of the Human Nature of Christ, but simply the Mother of God, because the Divine Nature, Eternally Begotten of God the Father, is united with the Human Nature in the Divine Personality of Jesus Christ.

Many Protestants do not know that both Luther and Calvin admitted the dogma of the divine maternity. Luther writes: "There is no honor, no beatitude, capable of approaching an elevation which consists in being, of the whole human race, the sole person, superior to all others, unequaled in the prerogative of having one Son in common with the Heavenly Father" (*Deutsche Schriften,* xiv., 250). Calvin writes: "We cannot acknowledge the blessings brought us by Jesus without acknowledging at the same time how highly God honored and enriched Mary in choosing her for the Mother of God" (*Comm. sur l'Harm., Evang.*, 20).

Bibliography: Barrett, *Our Lady in the Liturgy;* Friedel, *The Mariology of Cardinal Newman;* Ganss, *Mariolatry;* Garriguet, *La Vierge Marie;* Gerrard, *The Cult of Mary;* Hogan, *The Mother of Divine Grace;* Lattey (ed.), *The Incarnation,* ix.; Livius, *The Blessed Virgin in the Fathers;* Nesbitt, *Our Lady in the Church;* Neubert, *Marie dans l'Eglise Anténicéenne;* Newman, *Mary, the Mother of Jesus;* Northcote, *Mary in the Gospels;* Petitalot, *The Virgin Mother;* Pohle, *Mariology;* Schaefer, *The Mother of Jesus;* Stewart, *The Greater Eve;* Shahan, *The Blessed Virgin in the Catacombs;* Vassall-Phillips, *The Mother of God; The Mother of Christ;* Vonier, *The Divine Motherhood.* A. Q. 1878, 594.—C. E. xv. 459-472.—C. W. i. 129.—D. T. ix. 2339-2474.—Kirchenlexicon, viii., 711.

THE VIRGINITY OF MARY

How can you claim that Mary was always a virgin, when the Scriptures often speak of the brethren of Jesus (Matt. xii. 46-50; Mark iii. 31-35; Luke viii. 19-21; John vii. 3-10; Acts i. 14)?

The dogma of the Virgin Birth was defined as an article of faith by the Fifth General Council held at Constantinople under

Pope Vigilius in 553, and again by the Lateran Council held by Pope Martin I at Rome in 640. It is a dogma held unanimously by the Fathers of the Church from the very beginning, and taught explicitly in both the Old Testament and the New.

The prophet Isaias foretold the birth of Jesus Christ from a Virgin Mother. He says: "Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and His name shall be called Emmanuel" (Isa. vii. 14). The word he uses for virgin, *almah,* is always equivalent to virgin in the Old Testament (Gen. xxiv. 43; Exod. ii. 4; Canticles i. 2; vi. 7; Ps. lxvii. 26; Prov. xxx. 19). The Jews in their Septuagint version of the Old Testament (286-246 B. C.) translated *almah* by *parthenos,* the Greek equivalent for an inviolate virgin.

The New Testament teaches the Virgin Birth in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. "Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. i. 20). "The angel was sent from God to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph" (Luke i. 26, 27).

The Fathers of the first four centuries all teach the Virgin Birth: St. Justin Martyr (*Apol.,* xxxi., 46; *Dial. cum Tryp.,* 85); Aristides (*Apol.*); St. Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.,* v., 19); Origen (*Hom.,* vii., *In Lucam*); St. Hilary (*In Matt.,* i., 3), St. Epiphanius (*Adv. Hær.,* lxxviii., 1-7; St. Jerome (*Adv. Helv.*).

Although a few of the Fathers, like St. Epiphanius (*Adv. Hær.,* lxxxviii., 7), St. Gregory of Nyssa (in *Christi Ress.,* ii.) and St. Cyril of Alexandria (*In Joan.,* vii., 5) held that "the brethren of the Lord" were children of St. Joseph by a former marriage, the vast majority held with St. Jerome that they were cousins of Jesus. The Fathers give four reasons why they were not Mary's children. 1. They argue that her virginity was implied by her answer to the angel: "How shall this be done, because I know not man" (Luke i. 34); 2. If Mary had other children, why is Jesus so emphatically called "the Son of Mary?" (Mark vi. 3), and why is Mary never called the Mother of the brethren of the Lord?; 3. The Gospel texts all imply that the brethren were older than Jesus. They were jealous of His popularity; they criticized Him and gave Him advice; they endeavored to lay hold on Him on the supposition that He was mad (Mark vi. 4; John vii. 1; Mark iii. 31); 4. If Mary had other children, why should Jesus, dying on the Cross, have intrusted His Mother to the care of St. John? (John xix. 26, 27.)

We will never know to a certainty the exact relationship of the four brothers, James, Joseph, Simon and Jude. It will always remain doubtful whether "Mary of Clopas (Cleophas) was the wife of Clopas or his sister. In either case her children, James and Joseph, were cousins of Jesus, either on the mother's or the father's side. It will always remain doubtful whether

James, the brother of the Lord, is James the Apostle, the son of Alphæus; and again, whether his father Alphæus is the same as Clopas (Alphæus-Clopas), the brother of St. Joseph. If both hypotheses are true, and we think they are, then Jude was a cousin of Jesus on both his mother's and his father's side.

The word "brother" in itself proves nothing, for it had a very wide meaning among the Jews. It is used in the Old Testament for relatives in general (Job xlii. 2; xix. 13, 14), nephews (Gen. xiii. 18; xxiv. 14; xxix. 15), distant cousins (Lev. x. 4), and first cousins (1 Par. xxiii. 21, 22). Besides there was no word in Hebrew or Aramaic for cousin, so that the Old Testament writers were forced to use the word *AH*, brother, to describe different degrees of kindred. For example, Jacob, speaking of his cousin Rachel, calls himself her father's brother, rather than style himself the son of her father's sister, the only way he could in Hebrew describe his real relationship (Gen. xxix. 12). It is certain, therefore, that if Jesus had cousins, especially if they were born of the same mother, they must needs be called in the Aramaic tongue, His brethren.

Bibliography: Conway, *The Virgin Birth;* Corluy, *Les Frères de Jésus Christ;* Durand, *The Childhood of Jesus Christ;* Lagrange, *Evangile selon Saint Matthieu, S. Marc et S. Luc.* C. G. Jan., 1924.—D. B. i. 418; ii. 807, 1084, 1673, 1806.—D. T. ix. 2369-2385.—E. T. 1878, 15, 145.—R. B. 1908, 8.—I. T. April Oct., 1913.

THE VIRGIN BIRTH NOT BORROWED FROM PAGANISM

Was not your dogma of the Virgin Birth taken over from paganism? Were not the gods of Mithra of Persia, Adonis of Syria, Osiris of Egypt and Krishna of India all virgin born?

No, for although there are points of similarity between Christianity and the various pagan religions, the Virgin birth is certainly not one of them. The rationalist Harnack says: "The conjecture of Usener, that the idea of the birth from a virgin is a heathen myth which was received by the Christians, contradicts the entire development of Christian tradition (*History of Dogma,* i., 100).

Mithra had no human mother at all, but was invariably regarded as "rock-born," imaged by a conical stone which represented the sky vault in which the light-god first appeared. Adonis, or Tammuz (Ezech. viii.) was a demi-god, representing the light of the sun. Various myths make him the son of Cinyras, of Phoenix, and of King Theias of Assyria and his

daughter Myrrha. Osiris is either the son of Seb (the Earth) and Nuït (the Sky), or begotten of the heart of Atûm, the first of the gods and of men. Krishna, the most popular of the avatars or incarnations of Vishnu, was not virgin born, for the black god's mother had borne several children to her husband Vasudeva, before he was born. The legends that liken him to Christ are taken from documents that post-date the Gospels by several centuries (Tisdall, *Mystic Christs*, 27).

The ancient pagan myths are taken from nature, representing the succession of day and night, or of the seasons, and the mystery of life and its transmission from one creature to another. They are undated, and unlocated, and generally belong to a vaguely imagined period before the coming of man. But the account of our Lord's birth has the form, not of myth, but of history; place, date and contemporary persons and events are specified, and it is interwoven not only with the texture of general history, but also with the events of our Lord's life in such a way as to be inseparable from the Gospel account of them (*C. G.*, April, 1923). As Martindale says: "Conscious adaptation of myth by the Gospel writers is a grotesque supposition, neglected by reputable scholarship; there was no time for an unconscious deformation of historical events in view of the early date now generally admitted for the composition of the Gospels" (*The Virgin Birth*, 30).

Bibliography: Martindale (ed.), *The History of Religions*, i.; *Hinduism; Egypt*, ii.; *Ancient Greece; Mithra.*

Do not the words "before they came together" and "till she brought forth her first born Son" prove that the Marriage of Mary and Joseph was really consummated later on (Matt. i. 18; Luke ii. 7)?

They prove nothing of the kind. These texts, which were adduced against the Virgin birth by Helvidius in the fourth century, were ably answered by St. Jerome. In reply he cited many passages from the Scriptures to prove that the words *before* and *till* did not imply the subsequent occurrence of the things in question. "Noe, opening the window of the ark, sent forth a raven, which went forth, and did not return *till* the waters were dried up upon the earth" (Gen. viii. 6, 7)—*i. e.*, the raven never returned. Or again: "And no man hath known of his sepulchre *until* the present day" (Deut. xxxiv. 6)—*i. e.*, no one ever discovered where Moses had been buried.

Do not the words: "She brought forth her first born Son" imply that Mary had at least two children (Matt. i. 25)?

Not at all. The Mosaic law of the first born (Exod. xxxiv. 19, 20) held as soon as the mother had given birth to a son, whether he was the only one, or whether he was succeeded by other children. The Jews frequently spoke of a mother dying, when bringing forth her first born son.

THE GENEALOGIES OF CHRIST

Should not the whole Gospel of the Infancy be rejected because the two genealogies of Christ in St. Matthew and St. Luke are totally different and irreconcilable? How can Jesus be the Son of David, when Joseph, by whom He is of the blood of David, is not His real father?

One theory, held by Julius Africanus (221), and cited in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* (i. 7), holds that Jacob is the real father of Joseph (Matt. i. 16), and Heli his legal father, according to the Jewish law of the levirate (Luke iii. 23). For when a childless widow married her deceased husband's brother, the children were called by the name of the first husband (Deut. xxv. 5). This interpretation was commonly held up to the fifteenth century on the authority of Eusebius. The chief objection to it rises from the fact that it necessitates the acceptance of two other levirate marriages to explain Salathiel, the son of Jechonias (Matt. i. 12), and of Neri (Luke iii. 27), and Mathan (Mathat), the son of Eleazar (Matt. i. 15), and of Levi (Luke iii. 29).

A second theory, proposed by Annius of Viterbo in 1490, declares that St. Matthew gives the genealogy of St. Joseph, and St. Luke the genealogy of the Blessed Virgin. This view is held to-day by Bishop Le Camus in his *Life of Christ* (i., 151) and by Rose in his *Studies on the Gospels* (69), but their arguments fail to convince us. We cannot accept it, for it goes counter to the constant tradition of the early Fathers of the Church, and the Jewish custom of drawing up the genealogies of only paternal ancestors.

A third theory, commonly held to-day, asserts that St. Matthew gives us the legitimate succession, whereby *the Davidic rights* came through St. Joseph to Jesus, while St. Luke gives us the *real* and *legal ancestors,* who, through St. Joseph, connect Jesus with David.

The Jews of our Lord's time believed that the Messias was descended from David (Matt. xv. 22; xx. 30; xxii. 41-46), a fact that is taken for granted by St. Paul in his preaching (Rom. i. 3; xv. 12; Acts xiii. 23; *Cf.* Apoc. v. 6; xxii. 16). The Rabbis

disputed whether the Messias was to come from David through Solomon or through Nathan. The defenders of the Nathan line argued that Solomon had died in idolatry, and that his last descendant before the captivity, Jechonias, had been rejected by God (Jer. xxii. 30).

The genealogies of St. Matthew and St. Luke satisfy both points of view. The Davidic rights descended to Joseph and his legal Son Jesus through Solomon (Matt. i. 6, 7), whereas Jesus' true Davidic ancestry was traced through Nathan (Luke iii. 31).

According to this theory, St. Matthew's genealogy has but a conventional value. It consists of three groups of fourteen names, because the three Hebrew letters of David's name represent a numerical value of fourteen. To obtain this artificial symmetry, many names had to be omitted, as we see by comparing the forty-two generations summed up in verse 17 with the parallel genealogies of the Old Testament.

Whatever theory we hold—and we admit that no theory is absolutely satisfactory—Catholics accept the two genealogies as part of the Sacred Scriptures, guaranteed them by the divine infallible voice of an authoritative teaching Church. The rationalist critic is unscholarly and unfair, because he starts out with the set purpose of denying the historical value of a document which goes counter to his personal views.

Bibliography: E. Jan., 1896—R. A. vii. 357.—R. C. xlix. 129, 225; lv. 24, 688.

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION

Can you prove from the Scriptures that the Virgin Mary was miraculously conceived? Does not your doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin contradict the Scriptures, which teach that all men died in Adam (1 Cor. xv. 22; *Cf.* Rom. v. 12)?

Is this not a new teaching of your Church, first proclaimed in 1854?

We do not believe that the Virgin Mary was miraculously conceived. Her Son was born miraculously of a virgin Mother, but she herself had a real father and a real mother, St. Joachim and St. Anne. The doctrine means that at the very first instant when her soul was infused into her body, the Virgin Mary was sanctified by God's grace, so that her soul was never deprived of the sanctification, which all other creatures had forfeited by the sin of Adam. Her soul was never displeasing to God, because it had never been stained with original sin.

On December 8, 1854, Pope Pius IX defined that "the doc-

trine which declares that the most Blessed Virgin Mary, in the first instant of her conception, by a singular grace and privilege of Almighty God, in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Savior of the human race, was preserved exempt from all stain of original sin, is a doctrine revealed by God, and therefore must be believed firmly and constantly by all the faithful" (*Ineffabilis Deus*).

Rationalists and Broadchurchmen deny this dogma because they deny the existence of Original Sin, while orthodox Protestants deny it, because of their erroneous notion of Original Sin. Cardinal Newman writes: "Our doctrine of Original Sin is not the same as the Protestant doctrine. Original Sin with us cannot be called sin, in the mere ordinary sense of the word; it is a term denoting Adam's sin as transferred to us, or the state to which Adam's sin reduces his children; but by Protestants it seems to be understood as sin, in much the same sense as actual sin."

We, with the Fathers, think of it as something negative, Protestants as something positive. Protestants hold that it is a disease, a radical change of nature, an active poison actively corrupting the soul, infecting its primary elements, and disorganizing it; and they fancy we ascribe a different nature from ours to the Blessed Virgin, different from that of her parents, and from that of fallen Adam.

We hold nothing of the kind; we consider that in Adam she died as others; that she was included, together with the whole race, in Adam's sentence; that she incurred the debt as we do; but that for the sake of Him who was to redeem her and us upon the Cross, to her the debt was remitted by anticipation; on her the sentence was not carried out, except indeed as regards her natural death, for she died when her time came, as others.

All this we teach, but we deny that she had Original Sin; for by Original Sin we mean, as I have already said, something negative, namely, this only, the deprivation of that supernatural, unmerited grace which Adam and Eve had on their first formation—deprivation and the consequences of deprivation.

Mary could not merit, any more than they, the restoration of that grace; but it was restored to her by God's free bounty from and at the very first moment of her existence, and thereby, in fact, she never came under the original curse, which consisted in the loss of it" (*Difficulties of Anglicans*, ii., 48, 49).

The Scriptures nowhere expressly teach this doctrine, but Pius IX cites two passages, from which it may be inferred, if they are considered in the light of Catholic tradition. They are: "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed; she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel" (Gen. iii. 15). "Hail, full of grace, the

Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women" (Luke i. 28). Christ and His Mother are both spoken of as enemies of Satan and of sin; He, absolutely sinless as the Son of God, and she sinless, or full of grace, by God's special prerogative and gift.

The Blessed Virgin holds a unique position of dignity and pre-eminence in the writings of the early Fathers, many of whose statements would be exaggerated or untrue, had she been conceived in Original Sin. They imply her freedom from all sin by their insistence upon her perfect purity, and her position as the second Eve.

St. Irenæus (140-205) writes: "As Eve, becoming disobedient, became the cause of death both to herself and the whole human race, so also Mary, bearing the predestined Man, and being yet a virgin, being obedient, became both to herself and to the whole human race the cause of salvation" (*Adv. Hær.*, iii., 22). The same idea is set forth by St. Justin Martyr, Tertullian, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Ephrem of Syria, St. Epiphanius, St. Jerome and others, cited by Cardinal Newman in his letter to Dr. Pusey (*Cf.* Harper, *The Immaculate Conception*, 43-59). Of all the testimonies that might be given, St. Ephrem's (306-373) words of praise can only mean that Mary was immaculately conceived. He says that "she was as innocent as Eve before her fall, a Virgin most estranged from every stain of sin, more holy than the Seraphim, the sealed fountain of the Holy Ghost, the pure seed of God, ever in body and in mind intact and immaculate" (*Carmina Nisibena*, first discovered and published in 1866).

Bibliography: Harper, *The Immaculate Conception;* Kellner, *The Christian Festivals;* Livius, *The Blessed Virgin in the Fathers;* Newman, *Letter to Dr. Pusey;* Pohle, *Mariology;* Rickaby, *The Lord My Light*, 223-231; Storf, *The Immaculate Conception;* Ullathorne, *The Immaculate Conception;* Vacandard, *Etudes de Critique*, iii., 215. C. E. vii. 674-681.—D. Oct., 1893.—D. T. vi. 846-1218.—I. T. Oct., 1918.—R. A. vi. 766-844.—R. C. i. 173; viii. 276.

THE SINLESSNESS OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN

Why do Catholics claim that the Virgin Mary never committed sin, when the Bible says: "If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" (1 John i. 8)?

Catholics believe that the Blessed Virgin was free from all actual sin because of divine tradition confirmed by the Council of Trent. St. Augustine writes: "Except, therefore, the Holy Virgin Mary, about whom, on account of the honor of our Lord, I will not allow the question to be entertained, when sins are

under discussion—for how do we know what increase of grace was bestowed on her, to enable her to overcome sin in every way" (*De Natura et Gratia,* 36).

The Council of Trent defines: "If anyone says that man once justified can during his whole life avoid all sins, even venial ones, as the Church holds that the Blessed Virgin did by special privilege of God, let him be anathema" (Sess. vi., can. 23).

THE ASSUMPTION

Is there any Biblical or historical proof of the ascension of the Virgin Mary into heaven? Is the Assumption a dogma of the faith?

The dogma of the Assumption means the Blessed Virgin's entrance into heaven, body and soul by the power of God. The active term Ascension is used only of Jesus Christ's entrance into heaven by His own divine power. The doctrine has never been defined by the Church, although its wide acceptance since the sixth century renders it a certain doctrine, that cannot be denied by Catholics without rashness.

It cannot be proved from the Bible, or from contemporary historical witnesses, but it rests on such solid theological principles, that many Bishops have written the Apostolic See, requesting its definition as a dogma of the faith.

Some may think it strange that the Fathers of the first five centuries do not mention it. But as St. Augustine says: "There are many things that the universal Church maintains, and that we reasonably believe were preached by the Apostles, although they never have been put in writing (*De Bapt.,* v., 23). We can readily conjecture reasons for their silence. Perhaps they feared that certain heretics, like the Valentinians, might cite this doctrine in proof of their errors concerning the Body of Christ. Perhaps again they wished to keep the cultus of the Blessed Virgin in the background on account of the prevalent idolatry. Moreover, when bitter controversy was being waged on such important dogmas as the Trinity and the Incarnation, less important doctrines might well be ignored.

It certainly seems most fitting that the body of the Immaculate Mother of God should not taste corruption, and that it should share in the triumph of her Son, the Risen Christ. Kellner tells us that the feast of the Assumption in the East is older than the sixth century, for it was celebrated by the heretical sects that separated from Rome in the fifth century, *viz.,* the Monophysites, the Nestorians, the Armenians and the Ethiopians (Kellner, *The Christian Festivals,* 237). The most ancient writer

to speak of it in the West is St. Gregory of Tours (593) who writes: "The Lord had the most holy body of the Virgin taken into heaven, where, reunited to her soul, it now enjoys with the elect, happiness without end" (*De Gloria Mart.*, i., 109).

"A doctrine," says Renaudin, "universally held for over thirteen hundred years, could only have originated in a special revelation of our Lord to His Apostles" (*La Doctrine de l'Assumption*).

Bibliography: Conway, *Studies in Church History*, 71-87; Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, 272; Ernst, *Die Leibliche Himmelfahrt Mariæ*. C. G. Aug., 1927; May, 1928.—D. July, Oct., 1924.—D. T. I. 2127-2141.—E. T. Aug. 5, 1923.

Do Catholics adore the Virgin Mary, and consider her omnipresent, so that she can answer their prayers?

No, Catholics adore God alone, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. They love and reverence the Blessed Virgin, because God honored her above all creatures by choosing her to be the Mother of His only Son. St. Epiphanius in the fourth century condemned the Collyridians, the only sect in history, who gave her divine honors, saying: "We do not adore the saints. . . . Let Mary then be honored, but the Father, Son and Holy Ghost alone be adored" (*Adv. Collyrid.*, 29).

God alone is Omnipresent. The power of the Blessed Virgin to know our particular wants, and to answer our prayers no more implies omnipresence than my power to grant the request of a friend thousands of miles away implies my presence in that place. When Eliseus saw the ambush prepared for the King of Israel was he necessarily in Syria at the time (4 Kings vi. 9)? God can make known to His saints what we need, as we learn from His words in Job: "Go to My servant Job, and offer up a holocaust for yourselves; and My servant Job shall pray for you; for him I will accept lest I deal with you according to your folly" (Job xlii. 8). The saints see God "face to face as He is" (1 Cor. iii. 12; 1 John iii. 2), and in seeing God, they see in Him as in a mirror all that happens upon earth.

THE VENERATION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN

Why do Catholics pay so much honor to Mary, when she was only an ordinary woman? Does not Catholic devotion to her detract from the worship due to Christ?

The Catholic Church has always paid special honor to the Blessed Virgin, because God honored her above all creatures by bestowing upon her the highest dignity He could confer—the

divine maternity. The Scriptures tell us that Jesus honored her by dwelling with her under the same roof at Nazareth for thirty years until He began His public ministry, and that He showed His love to her on the Cross, when He left her to the kindly care of His beloved disciple, St. John (John xix. 26). I could never understand how intelligent men hoped to extol the Son of God by making little of the Mother of God. We do not win the affections of our fellowmen by despising or making little of their mothers.

How can you call Mary an ordinary woman, and at the same time pretend that you have studied the Scriptures? Would God choose an ordinary woman to be the Mother of His only Son, when He had countless millions of women to choose from? The prophet Isaias spoke of her coming centuries before (vii. 14), and God sent from heaven a special ambassador to announce her supereminent dignity (Luke i. 26), and another to comfort St. Joseph in his doubting (Matt. i. 20). Both the angel and St. Elizabeth called her "blessed among women" (Luke i. 28, 43), and her own prophecy that "henceforth all generations shall call me blessed" (Luke i. 48) is fulfilled to the letter every day by Catholics the world over.

Instead of detracting from the love of Christ, devotion to Mary increases our love for Him. The devout client of Mary is ever the strong defender of the divinity of Jesus Christ, her Son. The divine maternity, as the Council of Ephesus clearly recognized in 431, has ever been the standard of orthodox belief in the true doctrine of the Incarnation.

Love for Mary, the masterpiece of God's creation, by its very nature leads us to the love of Christ her Son. He cannot be jealous of the praise we give her, for every one of her privileges and prerogatives are His own free gift. Is the artist jealous of the praise you give his masterpiece? Is the author jealous of the praise you give his book?

MEDIEVAL LEGENDS

Are Catholics bound to believe all the legends of the Blessed Virgin that were current in the Middle Ages? Did not medieval devotion to the Virgin encourage harmful superstition, and go counter to the unique mediatorship of Christ? Are not some of the expressions used by Catholic writers in speaking of the Blessed Virgin inaccurate and blasphemous? What is your opinion of *The Glories of Mary?*

Catholics are not bound to believe the legends of the saints. The Church has always been most careful in weighing the evidence, before she sanctioned any miracle in the lives of her saints (Macken, *The Canonization of Saints;* Delehaye, *The Legends of the Saints*). If you would learn how carefully her critical scholars separate the true miracle from the false, I would ask you to read the Bollandists' *Lives of the Saints,* the most critical work of expert scholarship that has appeared during the past three hundred years (Delehaye, *The Work of the Bollandists*).

Even unbelievers grant that the medieval devotion to the Blessed Virgin fostered a respect for women, which nothing else could have effected. Lecky writes: "The world is governed by ideals, and seldom or never has there been one that has exercised a more salutary influence than the medieval conception of the Virgin." He says again: "There is, I think, little doubt that the Catholic reverence for the Virgin has done much to elevate and purify the ideal woman, and to soften the manners of men" (*Rationalism in Europe,* iii., 234; *History of European Morals,* ii., 389).

We readily admit that by falsely interpreting the fervid expressions of devotion of some Catholic writers, you may read into their books heresy or blasphemy, but is this honest? When Blackstone in his commentaries says that "the king can do no wrong," or that "the king never dies," or that "the king is the fountain of justice" (*Commentaries,* i., ch. 7, 246, 249, 270) would you call him a heretic or a blasphemer, and say that he ascribed impeccability or immortality to the king of England?

An intelligent Catholic always distinguishes carefully the language of devotion from the language of dogma, and instinctively interprets an exaggerated expression of some pious Latin writer by the exact wording of the creed, the catechism or a manual of theology.

St. Alphonsus, for example, wrote his *Glories of Mary* for the simple, uneducated, and imaginative peasant of Southern Italy. You may reject the legends he records if you will, but do not forget that his doctrine regarding the Blessed Virgin is thoroughly Catholic from start to finish. Let me quote a few passages. "No one denies that Jesus is the only Mediator of justice, who alone by His merits reconciles us with God." . . . "It would be a serious error to believe that God could not give us grace without the intercession of Mary." . . . "We acknowledge that God is the only Source of good, and that Mary is only a creature; all she has received is due to the grace of God."

The expressions of an ardent lover may not all be literally true, for warmth of feeling often produces exaggeration in language. But who cavils at this, and who asks the lover to speak

in matter of fact terms? Must there be no warmth in the expression of our love of the saints of God?

Bibliography: Hollweck, *Biographical Dictionary of the Saints.* A. Q. 1887, 312.—S. Sept., 1925.

Did not Christ speak harshly to the Virgin, saying to her at the marriage of Cana: "Woman, what have I to do with thee" (John ii. 4)?

The Catholic version is more accurate: "What (is it) to me and to thee?" According to Father Lagrange the Arabs of Palestine still use this same expression: "What to thee?" It has a two-fold meaning, either "attend to your own affairs," or when said smilingly, "Do not worry, all will turn out well." This second meaning is certainly the meaning here, for Christ immediately works the miracle of changing water into wine at His Mother's request.

The use of the word "woman" does not in the slightest degree imply any disrespect, or even emphasize, as some have falsely held, the infinite distinction between Mary, the creature, and her divine Son. It is simply a solemn mode of addressing anyone, as we know from our Lord's use of it on the Cross (John xix. 26).

Many honest Protestant commentators—Westcott, Bloomfield, Ellicott, Alford, Trench—admit that our Lord did not speak harshly to His mother in this passage. Trench writes: "It is true that in the address 'woman' there is nothing of severity or harshness, however much it may have some such sound to English ears. In those last and tenderest words which our Lord addressed to His Mother, He used the same language: 'Woman, behold thy Son.' So far from any harshness, the compellation has something solemn in it, and cannot but have such where the dignity of woman is truly felt. But it is otherwise with the words: 'What have I to do with thee?' . . . Any severity which these words may seem to have in reading, we cannot doubt was mitigated in the manner of speaking; suffering, as it did, a near compliance with her request to look as though an apparent refusal" (*On Miracles*, Ser. 1).

Bibliography: Lagrange, *Evangile selon Saint Jean*, 56, 57).

Did not Christ make little of His Mother, when in answer to the woman in the crowd who called her blessed He said: "Yea rather, blessed are they who hear the word of God and keep it" (Luke xi. 28)?

He did not. Father Ryder, answering this objection, said: "The comparison is one of relations, not of persons, and the

perfection of both relationships might culminate in the one person, as indeed was the case; for was she not "the handmaid of the Lord" (Luke i. 38) as well as His Mother, and did she not "keep all these things and ponder them in her heart?" (Luke ii. 19.) If in Christ's "yea rather" He be supposed to deprecate His Mother's cultus, He must no less be supposed to deprecate His own, for the woman in the crowd primarily extolled Him, and His Mother only for His sake. Doubtless He would turn men's minds from the *external* greatness of His Mother's prerogative as of His own, to fix them rather upon His and His Mother's truer glory, as when He said: "Callest thou Me good?" (Matt. xix. 17.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Ryder, *Catholic Controversy*. A. Q. 1895, 399.

Did not Christ disown His Mother, when He said, "My Mother and My brethren are those which hear the word of God and do it" (Luke viii. 21; *Cf.* Matt. xii. 46, 50)?

Not at all. He is simply taking occasion of the presence of His Mother and cousins to teach the people the necessity of keeping the word of God, as Mary did (Luke i. 38, 45; ii. 19, 51), and the necessity of detachment from even one's kinsfolk for the love of God. Tertullian writes: "Christ is wont to do everything that He enjoins upon others. How strange then would it certainly have been if, while He was teaching others not to esteem mother or father or brother as highly as the word of God, He were Himself to leave the word of God as soon as His Mother and brethren were announced to Him. He denied His parents, therefore, in the same sense in which He has taught us to deny ours—for God's sake" (*De Carne Christi*, 7).

St. Ambrose writes: "Jesus did not mean to reject the attentions of His Mother, for He Himself commands: 'Let whosoever dishonors father or mother die the death'; but He acknowledges Himself obliged to attend rather to the mysteries of His Father than to indulge maternal affection. His Mother is not disowned here, as some heretics insidiously pretend; even from the Cross He acknowledges her" (*In Luc*, viii., 20).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Lagrange, *L'Evangile selon Saint Luc*, 244. A. Q. 1894, 712.

THE ROSARY

What is the origin and meaning of the Rosary? Why do uneducated Catholics mechanically count their prayers on strings of beads? Did not Christ rebuke repetitions in prayer: "Use not vain repetitions as the heathens do" (Matt. vi. 7)?

The chief object of the Rosary devotion is meditation upon the mysteries of our Redemption. The fifteen mysteries—the Annunciation, the Visitation, the Nativity, the Presentation, the Finding in the Temple, the Agony, the Scourging, the Crowning with Thorns, the Carrying of the Cross, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, the Ascension, the Descent of the Holy Spirit, the Assumption and the Coronation of the Blessed Virgin—are an excellent summary of the Gospel. Catholics try to realize them clearly and to feel them deeply, while they recite fifteen decades or tens of Hail Marys with an Our Father between each one.

From the ninth to the twelfth century the priests of the monastic orders said Masses for their deceased brethren, while the uneducated lay brothers recited fifty Psalms or fifty Our Fathers. The recitation of fifty Hail Marys, divided in sets of ten, is first mentioned in the *Ancren Riwle* of the English anchoresses of the twelfth century. The counting of these prayers on strings of beads to prevent distraction soon became prevalent, and two hundred years later the practice of meditation on the mysteries was introduced by a Carthusian named Dominic.

The words ascribed to Christ in the faulty paraphrase, "avoid vain repetitions," are correctly translated in the Douay version, "speak not much" (*battologein*) as the heathens do. He was referring to the wordy eloquence, whereby the pagans endeavored to make the gods do their bidding (Seneca, *Epis.*, xxxi., 5; *Martial*, vii., 60). As St. Augustine wrote on this passage: "Truly 'much speaking' comes from the Gentiles, who give more attention to the elegant delivery of their prayers than to the cleansing of their souls." Christ was teaching the Apostles how to pray by giving them the most perfect of all prayers, the Lord's Prayer (Matt. vi. 9-15). At the same time He was condemning the Pharisees, "who loved to stand in the corners of the streets that they might be seen by men" (Matt. vi. 5). Such prayers were lip service only, for "they honored God with their lips, while their hearts were far from Him" (Matt. xv. 8; Isa. xxix. 13).

Christ never condemned repetitions in prayer, for He repeated the self-same prayer thrice in the Garden of Gethsemani (Matt. xxvi. 39, 42, 44), and He granted the gift of sight to the repeated prayers of the blind men (Matt. xx. 31). One of the most beautiful of the Psalms contains the recurrent antiphon: "Praise the Lord for He is good; for His mercy endureth forever" (Ps. cxxxv.), and the angels of God in heaven never tire of repeating day and night the canticle: "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty, who was, and who is, and who is to come" (Apoc. iv. 8; Isa. vi. 3).

Repeated prayers are not necessarily mechanical. A pianist like Paderewski may play the same concerto over and over again, and always play it with a perfect interpretation; an actor like Forbes Robertson may play the part of Hamlet night after night for months, and always reveal some new meaning in his lines. A mother can talk by the hour the most unintelligible baby talk to her child, and yet express in every word the deepest affection. Why then cannot Catholics repeat the Lord's Prayer and the Hail Mary, most of which is scriptural (Luke i. 28), over and over again without being accused of a lack of devotion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Lagrange, *Evangile selon S. Matthieu,* 122-124; Mother Loyola, *Hail Full of Grace;* McKenna, *Treasures of the Rosary;* Sheehan, *Vain Repetitions.* C. E. xiii. 184-188.

THE ANGELUS

What is the meaning of the Angelus?

The Angelus is a beautiful devotional custom of reciting three Hail Marys in the morning, noon and evening, in honor of the Incarnation. It derives its name from the first words of the prayer: "*The angel* of the Lord declared unto Mary." It goes back to the fourteenth century, and was originally a popular imitation of the night prayers of the monks. The morning Angelus bell was called the peace bell, as the Bishops often urged their people to pray for peace while it was being tolled. The midday Angelus in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was generally associated with the commemoration of our Lord's Death upon the Cross. The evening Angelus, in honor of our Lady of the Annunciation, probably goes back to the time of Pope Gregory IX (1239).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bridgett, *Our Lady's Dowry;* Rock, *The Church of Our Fathers,* iii. C. E. i. 486-488.—D. Jan., 1885.—E. Oct., 1917. —R. C. xxix. 5; xxxi. 71.

PRAYERS TO THE SAINTS

Why do Catholics pray to the Virgin and the Saints? Is not Christ the One Mediator of God and men (1 Tim. ii. 5) and our One Advocate with the Father (1 John ii. 1)?

The Church's teaching on the invocation of the saints is thus defined by the Council of Trent. "The saints, who reign together with Christ, offer up their own prayers to God for men. It is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to have

recourse to their prayers, aid and help for obtaining benefits from God, through His Son Jesus Christ, who alone is our Redeemer and Savior. Those persons think impiously who deny that the saints, who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked; who assert that they do not pray for men; who declare that asking them to pray for each of us in particular is idolatry, repugnant to the word of God, and opposed to the honor of the One Mediator of God and men, Christ Jesus" (Sess. xxv.).

The Old and New Testament plainly teach the principle and the practice of asking the prayers of our brethren, especially of the just (James v. 16-18). God commanded Abimelech to ask Abraham's prayers: "He shall pray for thee and thou shalt live" (Gen. xx. 7, 17). God had mercy on the sinful children of Israel in the desert because Moses interceded for them (Ps. xv. 23). God said to the friends of Job: "My servant Job shall pray for you; his face I will accept" (Job xliii. 8). St. Paul in his letters continually asked the brethren to pray for him (Rom. xv. 30; Eph. vi. 18, 19; 1 Thess. v. 25).

Is it reasonable to suppose that the Christian, who prayed for his brethren while upon earth, will lose all interest in them, once he reaches the kingdom of heaven? The Christian tradition from the beginning declares that the interest of the Saints in heaven will be increased a hundredfold, because they will realize then more fully our needs and necessities, and God's willingness to hearken to their intercession. St. Jerome (340-420) is a striking witness to this fact. He writes: "If Apostles and martyrs, whilst still in the flesh and still needing to care for themselves, can pray for others, how much more will they pray for others after they have won their crowns, their victories, their triumphs. Moses, one man, obtains God's pardon for six hundred thousand armed men, and Stephen prays for his persecutors. When they are with Christ will they be less powerful? St. Paul says that two hundred and seventy-six souls were granted to his prayers, whilst they were in the ship with him. Shall he close his lips after death, and not mutter a syllable for those who throughout the world have believed in his gospel? (*Adv. Vigil,* 6.)

That the angels pray for men we learn from the vision of Zacharias (i. 12, 13), and from the words of the angel Raphael to Tobias: "When thou didst pray with tears . . . I offered thy prayer to the Lord" (Tob. xii. 12). Christ Himself tells us that they have an interest in us, for He says: "There shall be joy before the angels of God upon one sinner doing penance" (Luke xv. 10). In another place He warns men not to scandalize little children, for they have angels to intercede for them in heaven (Matt. xviii. 10).

If the angels make intercession for us, certainly the saints, who are united to us by the bond of a common human nature, and by the supernatural bond of the Communion of Saints, have the same power and the same privilege.

The early Fathers unanimously teach the doctrine of the intercession of the saints.

St. Hilary (366) writes: "To those who would fain stand, neither the guardianship of the saints, nor the protection of the angels is wanting" (*In Ps.*, cxxiv.).

St. Cyril of Jerusalem (315-386) writes: "We then commemorate those who have fallen asleep before us, patriarchs, prophets, Apostles, and martyrs, in order that God, by their prayers and intercessions, may receive our petitions" (*Myst.*, v., 9).

St. John Chrysostom (344-407) writes: "When thou perceivest that God is chastening thee, fly not to His enemies . . . but to His friends, the martyrs, the saints, and those who were pleasing to Him, and who have great power" (*Orat.*, viii., *Adv. Jus.*, 6).

Catholics firmly believe in the unique mediatorship of Jesus Christ (1 Tim. ii. 5), and the Council of Trent emphasizes this very doctrine when declaring her teaching on the invocation of saints. Catholics believe that Jesus Christ alone redeemed us by His Death upon the Cross, thus reconciling us to God, and making us partakers of His grace here and His glory hereafter. No divine gift can reach us except through Christ and the merits of His Sacred Passion. Therefore, every prayer we pray, and every prayer in heaven of the Blessed Virgin, the angels and the saints, have their efficacy only through Jesus Christ our Lord. The saints simply add their prayers to ours, and, although specially pleasing to God because of their greater holiness, they aid us only through the merits of the One Mediator.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Moyes, *Why Catholics Pray to the Blessed Virgin*. Smith, *Prayers to the Saints;* Vacandard, *Etudes de Critique*, iii., 59

THE VENERATION OF IMAGES

Why do Catholics adore images and pray to them? Did not God prohibit the making of graven images (Exod. xx. 5)? Did not Catholics suppress the Second Commandment because it forbade the making of images? Why do you divide the Commandments in a different manner?

Catholics do not adore images or pray to them. The Council of Trent says: "The images of Christ and the Virgin Mother

of God, and of the other saints, are to be had and to be kept especially in churches, and due honor and veneration are to be given them; not that any divinity or virtue is believed to be in them, on account of which they are to be worshipped, or that anything is to be asked of them, or that trust is to be reposed in images, as was done of old by the Gentiles, who placed their hope in idols; but because the honor which is shown them is referred to the prototypes which these images represent; in such wise that by the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover the head, and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ, and we venerate the saints whose likeness they bear" (Sess. xxv.). This merely repeats the teaching of the Second Council of Nice in 787, which condemned the Eastern Iconoclasts, who held that reverence paid to images was a work of the devil and a new form of idolatry.

Even if we grant that God forbade the making of all images to the Jews, such a law would not bind Christians, as the positive Jewish law was abrogated by the Gospel (Rom. viii. 1, 2; Gal. iii. 23-25). There is certainly no inherent wickedness in making a graven image. The eternal law can never be abrogated; it will always be sinful "to adore them and serve them." We know that the Jews did not understand the command as an absolute prohibition of images, for we find a number of them in the Temple. There were, for example, the brazen serpent (Num. xxi. 9), the golden cherubim (Exod. xxv. 13; Ezech. i. 5; x. 20; 3 Kings vi. 23), the carved garlands of flowers, fruit and trees (Num. viii. 4; 3 Kings vi. 18; vii. 36), the carved lions which supported the basins and the King's throne (3 Kings vii. 24; x. 19, 20), and the ephod (Judges viii. 27; 1 Kings xix. 13). The Jews of the dispersion, despite their bitter hatred of idolatry, decorated their cemeteries with paintings of birds, beasts, fishes, men and women.

The early Christians adorned their Catacombs with many frescoes of Christ, the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, which recalled incidents in the Sacred Scriptures. The most common paintings were Moses striking the rock, Noe in the ark, Daniel in the lion's den, the Nativity, the Coming of the Wise Men, the marriage feast of Cana, the raising of Lazarus, and Christ the Good Shepherd. Statues were rare only because they were costly and difficult to make. When the Church came up from the Catacombs, she began to decorate her churches with costly mosaics, carvings, paintings and statues. No one can honestly accuse these early Christians of idolatry, for they died in protest against it by the thousands, and wrote treatise after treatise condemning it.

The Church has never suppressed the Second Commandment; she has abridged it occasionally in her children's catechisms

following thereby the good example set her in the Scriptures (4 Kings xvii. 35). The Old Testament tells us that there are Ten Commandments (Exod. xx. 1-17; Deut. v. 6-11), but gives no indication whatsoever how they are to be divided. The more logical Catholic division, following St. Augustine (*Quest. in Hept.*, ii., 71), has the First Commandment prohibiting false worship and idolatry, and the Ninth and Tenth the separate sins of lust and covetousness. The Protestant division makes one commandment of the two distinct sinful desires of adultery and theft, while it makes two of the one prohibition of false worship. This division is based on Philo, Josephus and Origen.

The iconoclasm of the Reformers in England and on the Continent was prompted chiefly by avarice, for the monasteries and churches were filled with priceless treasures of art, incrusted with gold and precious stones, which the Lutheran and the Tudor princes confiscated without the slightest scruple. Luther's animosity to the veneration of images was based on the false idea that people erected them to gain merit in God's sight and to perform good works, which he abominated. Again he wished to attack the Church on a point wherein her influence with the people was most apparent. He never grasped the profoundly religious and moral character of the veneration of images, and its consoling influence, manifested in the pilgrimages of his time (Grisar, v., 207-224).

Bibliography: Barnes, *The Early Church in the Light of the Monuments;* Delehaye, *Sanctus;* Hunter, *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology,* iii.; Leclercq, *Manuel d'Archaéologie;* Marucchi, *Elements d'Archaéologie Chrétienne;* Northcote-Brownlow, *Roma Sotterranea;* Slater, *Manual of Moral Theology.* C. E. vii. 644-672.—C. W. xxii. 409.—D. L. ii. 2376-2486.—D. T. vii. 180-302.

RELICS

Is it not superstitious to venerate the relics of the saints? What efficacy can there be in the bones of a dead man or woman, or in the garments belonging to them?

The Council of Trent teaches "that the holy bodies of holy martyrs and others now living with Christ—which bodies were the living members of Christ and the temples of the Holy Ghost—and which are by Him to be raised to eternal life and to be glorified, are to be venerated by the faithful; for through these bodies many benefits are bestowed by God on men, so that they who affirm that veneration and honor are not due to the relics of the saints, or that these and other sacred monuments are uselessly honored by the faithful, and that the places dedi-

cated to the memory of the saints are in vain visited with the view of obtaining their aid, are wholly to be condemned" (Sess. XXV.).

The Catholic Church does not teach that there is any magical virtue or any curative efficacy in the relic itself. The Church merely says, following the Scriptures, that they are often the occasion of God's miracles. In the Old Law we read of the veneration of the Jews for the bones of Joseph (Exod. xiii. 19; Jos. xxiv. 32), and of the prophet Eliseus which raised a dead man to life (4 Kings xiii. 21; *Cf.* Eccles. xlviii. 12); in the New, of the woman cured by touching the hem of our Lord's garment (Matt. ix. 20, 21), of the sick healed by the shadow of St. Peter (Acts v. 15, 16), and of the handkerchiefs and aprons that had touched the body of St. Paul (Acts xix. 12).

The veneration of the relics of the saints can be traced as far back as the second century. After St. Polycarp had been burned at the stake, his disciples "took up his bones, which were more valuable than precious stones and finer than refined gold, and laid them in a suitable place, where the Lord allows us to assemble in gladness and joy to celebrate the birthday of his martyrdom" (*Mart. Poly.*). Many of the early Fathers, while strongly repudiating the charge of idolatry or "cinder-worshipping," extol highly the cultus of relics, among them St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, and St. John Chrysostom. St. Jerome (340-420) writes: "We do not worship, we do not adore, we do not bow down before the creature rather than to the Creator, but we venerate the relics of the martyrs in order the better to adore Him whose martyrs they are" (*Ad Riparium,* ix.).

The same spirit that prompts a mother to treasure carefully a lock of her dead baby's hair; the same spirit that prompts Americans to treasure the pen of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, the Liberty Bell, or the sword of Washington, has ever prompted the Christian people to venerate whatever belonged to the saints of God.

The Catholic Church has never declared that any particular relic is authentic, but she takes the greatest pains to see that no public honor is paid to any relic, unless she is reasonably convinced of its genuine character. It matters little if the relic be not authentic, for the reverence we pay is to the saint. Since the World War, the nations of the world have erected monuments to the Unknown Soldier, in order to foster the spirit of patriotism. The particular soldier thus honored may have been a coward in war time, or an unworthy scoundrel. The honors we pay are given to the soldiers who died for their country.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Mioni, *Il Culto delle Reliquie.* C. E. xii. 734-738.

THE TRUE CROSS

What historical proof is there that the Cross on which the Savior died was really discovered by St. Helena? Are there not enough relics of the True Cross in existence to make at least three hundred of the original one?

Whether St. Helena herself discovered the True Cross may be questioned, but the fact that it was found in the early part of the fourth century (327) is attested by many a writer of the period. St. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat.*, iv., 10; x., 19; xiii., 4) mentions the fact in the Catecheses, which he delivered in the year 347 on the very spot, and an inscription of the year 359 found at Tixter in Mauretania speaks of the "wood of the Cross" (*Mélanges de l'Ecole de Rome*, x., 441).

Although Eusebius mentions the discovery of the Holy Sepulchre (*In Ps.*, lxxxvii., 13), he does not mention the finding of the Cross. But his *Life of Constantine* (iii., 30) contains a letter of the Emperor to Macarius, Bishop of Jerusalem, that seems to refer to it. Other writers of the fourth century refer to it, St. Paulinus of Nola, St. Ambrose, St. John Chrysostom, Sulpicius Severus, Socrates and Sozomen.

Constantine erected in 335 the Basilica of the Holy Cross on the site of our Lord's sepulchre, and the East celebrated the feast of its dedication on September 13.

The wood of the True Cross was publicly venerated in Jerusalem, and fragments of it were detached and dispersed by devotion throughout the whole world. St. Paulinus of Nola (353-431) sent a relic of it to his friend Sulpicius Severus, urging him to preserve it as a "protection in this life and a pledge of eternal life" (*Epis.* xxxi.).

Rohault de Fleury in 1870, after a careful study of all the relics of the True Cross in existence, found that altogether they would make two-fifths of a cubic foot out of an estimated Cross of six and five-eighths cubic feet of timber (*M.*, xliv., 358).

Bibliography: D. L. iii. 3131-3139.—D. T. iii. 2339-2363.

MIRACLES OF THE SAINTS

Must Catholics believe all the miracles recorded in the lives of the saints? I thought the age of miracles ended with the Apostles?

Miracles did not end with the Apostles. Christ Himself promised that miracles would always be a mark of His true Church, and a gift He would always bestow upon His faithful followers, the saints (Mark xvi. 17, 18; John xiv. 12). No un-

prejudiced man can read the testimony for the miracles of the saints canonized by the Apostolic See, and study the strict rules laid down by Pope Benedict XIV for the Church's guidance, without being convinced of their authenticity. Indeed evidence, which outsiders have considered convincing, has as a matter of fact been rejected by the Congregation of Rites at Rome as untrustworthy. The miracles wrought at Lourdes through the intercession of our Lady are always put to the severest tests of scientific scrutiny. The evidence may be read in the works of Bertrin, Boissarie, Marchand and others.

Miracles are historical facts, and, therefore, are always to be weighed according to the rules of historical evidence. Catholics are not bound to accept the pseudo-miracles of the medieval chroniclers, or of modern pious sentimentalists, but they strenuously protest against that modern rationalistic prejudice, which refuses to consider any evidence for their happening, because of a false presupposition of their impossibility.

Lingard, after mentioning many undoubted miracles in the history of the Anglo-Saxon Church writes: "There are also many which must shrink from the frown of criticism; some may have been the effect of accident or imagination; some that are more calculated to excite the smile than the wonder of the readers; and some which . . . depend on the distant testimony of writers not remarkable for sagacity or discrimination" (*Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church,* xii., 6).

PILGRIMAGES

What benefit can a Christian derive from pilgrimages, when God is present everywhere? Could not Catholics honor the saints without traveling so many miles to visit their shrines? Did not the idea originate in the pagan concept that the god was only powerful in certain places, as we read in 1 Kings xx. 23?

Pilgrimages must answer a need of the human heart, for, in every age and among all peoples, it has been customary to visit the places where the supposed god was born or died, or where wonders were said to be wrought. The Egyptian consulted the oracle of Ammon at Thebes, just as the Greek visited the oracle of Apollo at Delphi, or looked for a cure by his dreams in the temple of Asclepius. The Buddhist still goes to Benares, and the Mohammedan to Mecca.

Catholics are well aware that God is everywhere, and that we can pray to Him in every place. "The gates of heaven are equally open to the citizens of Jerusalem or of Britain," as St. Jerome once said. But since Jesus Christ dignified the Holy

Land by making it His dwelling place while upon earth, Christians from the very beginning have always desired to visit the cities hallowed by His presence. The same feeling prompts them to visit the shrines of the Blessed Virgin, the martyrs and the saints, who are associated with certain cities like Rome, Loreto, Lourdes, Compostella, Canterbury, Einsiedeln and St. Anne de Beaupré. It is certain that God has granted many favors, temporal and spiritual, to His people at these shrines, and visiting them has caused Catholics to pray with greater fervor, to do more penance for their sins, and to receive Communion more frequently.

The Bible tells of Elcana and Anna going every year to pray at Silo (1 Kings i. 3), and of our Lord Himself taking part in the annual Jewish pilgrimage to Jerusalem (Luke ii. 41).

The friends of St. Jerome, St. Paula and St. Eustochium, wrote from Jerusalem to Marcella at Rome, urging her to imitate the example of countless Christians who out of devotion visited the Holy Places. St. John Chrysostom in the same century speaks of the piety of the Christians "who visited the spots where the saints had lived" (*In Phil.*), and declared that he would gladly have made a pilgrimage to Rome to visit, were it at all possible, the prison in which St. Paul had been confined (*In Eph. Hom.*, 8). St. Augustine writes of the miracles wrought at the shrines of St. Gervasius and Protasius (*Epis.* 87).

Besides fostering the devotion of the people, pilgrimages had many another good effect. They contributed to the growth of many a medieval city; they caused many a good road to be built; they increased communication between foreign countries; they gave rise to medieval miracle plays; they gave stay-at-homes a knowledge of the geography of other lands; they brought into being religious orders like the Knights of St. John, and the Knight Templars; they kept Europe from becoming Mohammedan through the Crusades.

Like every good thing in this world, they were open to abuse, as we learn from the strong condemnation of St. Gregory of Nazianzus in the fourth century (*Epis.* ii.), and from the colloquies of Erasmus in the sixteenth. But both writers make a clear-cut distinction between the good effects and the bad. Erasmus, who is often cited against them, writes: "If anyone goes on a pilgrimage of his own free choice, and from a pious motive, I hold that he ought to be free to do so" (*Colloquies* 35).

Bibliography: Camm, *Forgotten Shrines;* McKerlie, *Shrines in Alsace and Lorraine;* Meistermann, *Guide to the Holy Land.* A. C. 1892, 602.—C. E. xii. 85-99.—C. W. lxii. 14.

THE PARTICULAR AND GENERAL JUDGMENTS

Is there a probation after death? How do you prove from the Bible that there is a Judgment immediately after death? If there is, what need is there of a General Judgment (Matt. xxiv. 37; 2 Peter ii. 7)?

Death, according to Catholic teaching, is universal (Jos. xxiii. 14; 3 Kings ii. 2; Heb. ix. 27); it is a punishment due to Adam's sin (Gen. ii. 17; iii. 19; Rom. v. 13; vi. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22); it ends the state of probation, excluding in the hereafter the possibility of further merit or demerit (Eccles. xi. 3; Matt. xxiv. 42; xxv. 13; John xix. 4; 2 Cor. v. 10).

The Particular Judgment, although never expressly mentioned in the Bible, is clearly implied in the passages which speak of an immediate retribution after death. Christ taught that Dives and Lazarus were punished immediately after death (Luke xvi. 22), and He promised the penitent thief the happiness of Paradise at once (Luke xxiii. 43). St. Paul also spoke of heaven as the immediate reward of the blessed (2 Cor. v. 6-8; *Cf.* Phil. i. 21).

St. Augustine (354-430) writes: "Souls are judged when they depart from the body, before they come to that Judgment (The General Judment) which must be passed on them when reunited to the body, and are tormented or glorified in that same flesh which they here inhabited" (*De Anima et ejus Origine,* ii., 8).

Pope Benedict XII in 1336 defined in his Bull *Benedictus Deus* that "the souls of those who depart this life in the state of mortal sin descend into hell immediately after death, and are there subject to infernal torments" and those who die in the state of sanctifying grace "behold the Divine Essence intuitively and face to face." This was also the teaching of the Council of Florence in 1439.

The General Judgment is contained as an article of faith in all the ancient Creeds—the Apostles', the Nicene and the Athanasian. The prophets of the Old Law call it the "Day of the Lord" (Joel ii. 31; Ezech. xiii. 5; Isa. ii. 12). Our Lord describes it in minute detail (Matt. xxiv. 27; xxv. 31), and His Apostles mention it most frequently (Acts x. 42; xvii. 31; Rom. ii. 5-16; xiv. 10; 1 Cor. iv. 5; 2 Cor. v. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Thess. i. 5; James v. 7).

The purpose of the General Judgment is to manifest before the whole human race the Mercy and Justice of God. It will embrace all our works and sins, even our idle words and most secret thoughts (Matt. xii. 36; 1 Cor. iv. 5). The chief events that will precede it are the universal preaching of the Gospel (Matt. xxiv. 14), the conversion of many Jews (Rom. xi. 25),

the great apostasy and the coming of Antichrist (2 Thess. ii. 3), and many extraordinary disturbances of nature (Matt. xxiv. 29; 2 Peter iii. 10).

Bibliography: Bautz, *Weltgericht und Weltende;* Delattre, *Le Second Evènement de Jésus Christ;* Labauche, *God and Man,* ii., 314; Oswald, *Eschatologie;* Pohle, *Eschatology,* 1-27, 103-120; Prat *The Theology of St. Paul,* ii.; Rademacher, *Der Weltuntergang;* Ratton, *The Apocalypse;* Tixeront, *History of Dogmas,* ii. C. E. i. 599; viii. 549.—D. T. viii. 1721-1828.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY

Is not the dogma of the Resurrection of the Body unreasonable? How is it possible that we shall all rise again with the same bodies we possessed while upon earth? Are not our bodies constantly changing?

The Resurrection of the Body, while eminently reasonable, is a miraculous event, due solely to the Omnipotence of God. Human reason of itself could never know it with certainty; we believe it firmly, because the Catholic Church, the infallible teacher of divine revelation, in the name of the Bible and tradition, has declared it an article of faith in her Creeds—the Apostles', the Nicene and the Athanasian—and in her Councils, *viz.,* the Council of Constantinople (553), and the Fourth Lateran in 1215. The last named Council declares that "all men shall rise again with their own bodies, which they now bear, to receive according to their works."

The doctrine is taught in the Old Testament at first vaguely, but afterwards with increasing definiteness. The prophets predict the restoration of Israel under the figure of a general resurrection (Osee vi. 3; xiii. 14; Ezech. xxxvii. 11), and refer to Christ's Resurrection as a pledge of our own (Ps. xv. 10). While the texts of Isaias (xxvi. 19-21) and Daniel (xii. 2) do not clearly assert a general resurrection, and the oft-cited passage of Job (In my flesh I shall see God—xix. 25-27) loses its force when compared with the original Hebrew; they are often cited by the early Fathers as proof of the Resurrection of the Body. The one clear and unequivocal text of the Old Testament is found in Second Machabees (vii. 10, 11).

Our Lord taught the Resurrection of the Body frequently, and attributed the denial of the Sadducees to their ignorance of the Scriptures (Matt. xxii. 29; Mark xii. 18-27; Luke xx. 27-38; John v. 28, 29; vi. 39, 40; xi. 23-26). His own Resurrection

(Luke xxiv. 39-43; John xx. 20, 27, 28) in His identical Body confirms His teaching of our bodily resurrection.

St. Paul preached the Resurrection from the Dead as one of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity at Athens (Acts xvii. 18, 31, 32), at Jerusalem (Acts xxiii. 6), before Felix (Acts xxiv. 15), and before Agrippa (Acts xxvi. 8), besides mentioning it in many passages of his Epistles (Rom. viii. 11; 1 Cor. vi. 14; xv. 12; 2 Cor. iv. 14; vi. 1; Phil. iii. 21; Thess. iv. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 11; Heb. vi. 2). He proves the Resurrection of the Dead from the Resurrection of Christ, declaring that "if there be no Resurrection of the Dead, then Christ is not risen again" (1 Cor. xv. 13; *Cf.* St. Thomas III., Q. lvi., art. 1).

All the early Fathers teach clearly the Resurrection of the Body, for they were called upon continually to defend it against the universal pagan denial of immortality, and the Gnostic heresy that all matter was evil. While declaring that it could be known only by divine revelation, they showed that it was not impossible in view of the Omnipotence of God (St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Cat.*, 18), and they argued its fittingness from the fact that the body had been the temple of the Holy Spirit, nourished by the Eucharist (St. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iv., 18). They also taught that it was unnatural to deprive the body of its share in the soul's future reward of punishment (St. Clement, *Ad Cor.*, i., 25), and often appealed to analogies in nature and in revelation, such as the seed dying and springing up again, the succession of the seasons, the sign of Jonas the prophet (Matt. xii. 39, 40).

The dogma of the Resurrection of the Dead implies more than the immortality of the soul (Major, *A Resurrection of Relics*); it teaches a real and complete resurrection of man in the fullness of his nature. There is a three-fold identity in the risen man, which makes him the same human person he was from birth; identity of soul, identity of bodily life, and identity of the ultimate material substance of his body. All Catholic theologians agree that there is complete identity of soul, for the soul is the chief factor in determining personal identity. All agree also in holding that the giving back of man's bodily life is the very heart of the Resurrection miracle and mystery. But while the majority of theologians are in favor of the identity of matter in man's natural and risen state, a minority hold that such material identity is unnecessary. We are well aware that the material substance of which the body is composed is continually changing, but reason and experience tell us that this ever continuing process in no way interrupts the vital identity of the body from infancy to old age.

Catholics believe with St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 42-44) that the risen body will possess added qualities, which in no way interfere with their substantial sameness. It will be impassible, *i. e.*,

immortal and incorrupt. "It shall rise in incorruption." "Neither can they die any more" (Luke xx. 36). "It shall rise in glory," *i. e.*, "shine as the sun in the kingdom of their Father" (Matt. xiii. 43). "It shall rise in power," *i. e.*, no longer subject to the limitations of space, like our Lord's Resurrected Body. "It shall rise a spiritual body," *i. e.*, endowed with spiritual and supernatural qualities.

"In every resurrection," writes Father Vonier, "there is the direct act of God producing a life that is no longer in any shape or form, and making it to be the identical life that once was. The identity of bodily life has only one source, the Omnipotence of God, who can make these things to be again that have vanished from the realms of being" (*The Life of the World to Come*, 155).

Bibliography: Brinquant, *La Résurrection de la Chair;* Chadouard, *La Philosophie de la Résurrection de la Chair;* McCann, *The Resurrection of the Body;* Schmid, *Der Auferstehungsglaube in der Bibel;* Vonier, *The Life of the World to Come*, 132-168. B. May, June, 1922.—C. E. xii. 792.—D. A. iv. 982-1004.—D. L. iii. 1879-1906.—E. April, 1920.—R. C. xlii. 225.

THE MILLENNIUM

What does your Church teach regarding the one thousand years reign of Christ at the end of the world, or the Millennium (Rev. xx. 4-7)?

The Catholic Church has never considered the Millennium as an article of faith, or held that it was taught by the Scriptures or Apostolic tradition. Some of the early Church writers—Papias, Tertullian, St. Irenæus, St. Justin—held millenarian views, due chiefly to a literal interpretation of some of the prophetical books, and the Apocalypse of St. John. The Gnostic Cerinthus, who believed in an earthly sensual paradise, was undoubtedly a heretic, like the Anabaptists of sixteenth century Germany.

There is no trace of Millenarianism in the Gospels or the Epistles. The resurrection of the just and the unjust, the general Judgment and the end of the world are mentioned as happening in close succession, leaving no possible room for the mythical reign of Christ for one thousand years. Although the text quoted above is most obscure, it is generally taken to mean the spiritual combat between Christ and His Church against Satan and the powers of evil. St. Augustine interpreted the words of St. John allegorically. The first resurrection represents redemption and the call to the Christian life; the reign of Christ and His saints represents the Church and her Apostolic work upon earth; the

thousand years signify either the thousand years immediately preceding the judgment, or the whole duration of the Church (*De Civ. Dei.*, xx., 6, 7).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Gry, *Le Millénarisme;* Paganini, *Das Ende der Welt;* Ratton, *The Apocalypse of St. John;* Tixeront, *History of Dogmas,* ii., 426. C. E. viii. 552; x. 307.—R. C. xxxix. 182.

THE DEVIL

Must Catholics believe in a personal devil? Why did God create the devil? Why if God is all good, does He not destroy the devil?

The Fourth Lateran Council teaches: "The devil and other demons were created by God good by nature, but they became bad through their own fault." God did not create the devil, but a pure angelic spirit, Lucifer (Isa. xiv. 12), who out of pure malice and pride rebelled against Him, and was condemned to Hell with the other angels he seduced (Luke x. 18; Jude i. 6; 2 Peter ii. 4; Apoc. xii. 7-9). The Scriptures mention him as the tempter of our first parents (Gen. iii. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 3), of David (1 Par. xxi. 1), of our Lord in the desert (Matt. iv. 10), of Judas (Luke xxii. 3), and of all mankind (Luke xxii. 31; John viii. 44; 2 Cor. iv. 4; 1 Peter v. 8).

If God had been forced to change His divine plan because of the conduct of one of His creatures, *v. g.*, by destroying the devil, He would thereby have submitted to the will of a creature, and His action would have been dependent on the action of a creature. That would imply that God would no longer have been God. Satan's power and the power of evil spirits to tempt us is indeed great, as the Apostle teaches (Eph. vi. 11, 12), but "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that which you are able; but will make also with temptation issue, that you may be able to bear it" (1 Cor. x. 13).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Vonier, *The Angels.* D. L. iv. 322-407.

HELL

Can you prove an eternal Hell from reason alone? Did the Jews believe in Hell? Does not the Jewish word *sheol* mean the grave? Why do Catholics believe in an eternal Hell? Were not many early Fathers Universalists?

Reason cannot prove that hell is eternal; it can merely show that the doctrine does not involve any contradiction. We can learn of eternal punishment solely from divine revelation.

The Catholic Church has always taught that those who die in mortal sin are condemned by God to Hell forever. The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) and the Council of Trent (Sess. vi., ch. 14; Sess. xiv., can. 5) both speak of the lot of the impenitent as "everlasting and eternal punishment" and "eternal damnation."

It is true that the Hebrew word *SHEOL* in the Old Testament generally means the grave, or the other world of either the good (Gen. xxxvii. 35) or the bad (Num. xvi. 30). It has that meaning sometimes even in the New (Acts ii. 27; Apoc. xx. 13). The Jews had at first a very vague idea of the hereafter, although God protected them always from falling into the current pagan errors of pantheism, dualism and metempyschosis (*D. B.*, iv., 1316). They believed in the other world, but their minds were chiefly on this one, intent upon personal happiness and national prosperity (*C. E.*, v., 531). In the Pentateuch, Josue, Judges and Kings there is no explicit distinction between the lot of the good and the wicked in the hereafter (Vigouroux, *La Bible et les Découvertes Modernes*, iv., 585). Job is the first to assert the reward of the just in the other life, thus implicitly proclaiming the punishment of the wicked (xiv., xvi. 8). The Psalms (xlviii., lxxii., xci., xcv., cix); Ecclesiastes (xi., xii.); Proverbs (x., xi., xiv., xxiv.), and the minor prophets (Joel iii. 1-21; Soph. i., iii.) speak of a divine Universal Judgment, clearly implying the punishment hereafter of the wicked. Isaias (lxxvi.), Ezechiel (xxxii.) and Daniel (xii.) mention the eternal punishment of the wicked.

The New Testament teaches the doctrine of Hell clearly on its every page. St. John the Baptist insists upon it to urge his hearers to do penance for their sins (Matt. iii. 10, 12; Luke iii. 7, 9, 17; John iii. 36). In asking men to follow Him and believe His Gospel, Christ continually tells them that their eternal salvation is at stake; that if they die in their sins they will merit eternal punishment. Thus He warns them against the sin against the Holy Ghost (Matt. xii. 32), and the sin of scandal (Matt. xviii. 8); He urges the duty of fraternal charity (Matt. v. 32), and the virtue of chastity—all under the penalty of Hell. The Kingdom of Heaven is for those "who do His Father's will," the penalty of Hell for "the workers of iniquity" (Matt. vii. 21-23).

Many of our Lord's parables end with the condemnation to Hell of the wicked: *v. g.*, the parable of the tares and the wheat (Matt. xiii. 24-30), of the net (Matt. xiii. 47-50), of Dives and Lazarus (Luke xvi. 18-31), of the great supper (Luke xiv. 16-24), of the royal wedding feast (Matt. xxii. 1-14), of the wise and foolish virgins (Matt. xxv. 1-13), and of the talents (Matt. xxv. 14-30).

In His description of the Last Judgment our Lord pictures

the final separation of the good from the wicked, to whom He will say: "Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire" (Matt. xxv. 41).

Some have pretended that the Gospel of St. John contradicts Christ's teaching in the Synoptics, but this is not true, for the future destiny of man is always pictured under the general idea of eternal life or eternal loss (John iii. 3, 15, 16; vi. 40, 55, 59; xii. 25, 48, 50; xvii. 2; xx. 31).

The Apostles repeat the Lord's teaching. St. Peter says that false prophets and lying teachers shall perish in their corruption, and be tormented in Hell like the rebel angels (2 Peter ii. 1, 4, 9, 12). St. Jude speaks of ungodly men, deniers of Christ, who like the fallen angels and the wicked cities of Sodom and Gomorrha, shall suffer the punishment of eternal fire and shall be cast into eternal darkness (Jude 4, 6, 7, 8, 12). St. Paul consoles the Thessalonians by promising them a future joy and reward for their patience and faith, while he assures them that their persecutors shall be banished eternally from the Lord, and deprived forever of His glory, meriting tribulation and eternal punishment in destruction (2 Thess. i. 6-9). The wicked shall not possess the kingdom of God (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10; Gal. v. 19-21; Eph. v. 5).

Universalists have held that the Greek word *aionios* does not mean everlasting, but age long, *i. e.*, a long period, but not an unending one (Matt. xxv. 46). But the same Greek word is used for "everlasting life" and for "everlasting punishment." As no one holds that the reward of the just will come to an end, is it not unreasonable to suppose that Christ meant the punishment of the wicked to cease after a time. Oxenham says: "If Christ had intended to teach the doctrine of eternal punishment, could He possibly have taught it in plainer or more direct terms. If He did not intend to teach it, could He possibly have chosen language more certain *a priori* to mislead, as the unbroken experience of eighteen centuries proves *a posteriori* that it always has misled the immense multitude of His disciples" (*Eschatology*, ch. iv., 102).

It is true that some of the early Christian Fathers denied the eternity of Hell, led astray by the errors of Origen (185-255), who believed in "a restoration (*apokatastasis*) of all things"; *v. g.*, St. Gregory of Nyssa (395) and probably St. Gregory of Nazianzus (330-390); *Cf. D. T.*, v., 68. But Origen was condemned by a synod of Constantinople in 543, and again by the Fifth General Council of Constantinople in 553. With these few exceptions the Fathers are unanimous in teaching with the Scriptures the doctrine of an eternal Hell. St. Ignatius of Antioch (98-117) says that "false teachers who corrupt the faith shall be deprived of the kingdom of God, and shall go into un-

quenchable fire" (*Ad Eph.*, xvi., 2). St. Justin Martyr (165) declares that if Hell does not exist, "either there is no God, or if there is, He does not concern Himself with men, and virtue and vice have no meaning" (*Apol.*, ii., 9; *Cf. Apol.*, i., 8, 12, 17, 18).

Tertullian (160-240) asserts against Marcion that there is a Hell, and that the fear of it is necessary in order that men may practice virtue (*Adv. Marcion,* xxvi., xxviii.). St. Basil (331-379) in many a passage speaks of the eternal punishment of Hell, insisting upon both the pain of loss and the pain of sense. "Sinners pretend to question it," he says, "so as to keep on sinning with impunity. It is clearly taught by our Lord and His Apostles" (*De Sancto Spiritu,* xvi.; *In Ps.,* xxxiii.; *Regulæ breviter tract,* cclxvii.; *Exort. ad Bapt.,* xiii. 8).

St. John Chrysostom (344-407) condemned the universalism of Origen, and answered the current objections of heretics and pagans against eternal punishment. No one in the East ever taught the doctrine so plainly, or insisted upon it more frequently, as he did in his sermons addressed to the corrupt society of both Antioch and Constantinople (*Hom.* viii., *In Thess.; In Matt.,* xi., 7; xvii., 7; xxxvi., 3; *In 2 Cor.,* ix.; *Ad Phil.,* iii., 2; *Ad Heb.,* i., 4).

St. Augustine (354-430) proves the doctrine of Hell from the Scriptures and reason, and answers more fully than any other Father the objections current in his time. His teaching may be studied in the two hundred pages of Lehaut's *L'Eternité des Peines de l'Enfer dans St. Augustin.*

The universal conviction of mankind that the wicked will be punished after death with a just punishment proves the existence of Hell. It is difficult to believe that all men would go astray concerning so fundamental a fact, affecting their lives here and hereafter.

"The denial of an ultimate sanction," writes Father Arendzen, "would lead to the absurd statement that a man might blaspheme and hate God, and fling up to heaven his deliberate preference of some loathsome pleasure to the possession of Him, and that he might do so with the calm certainty that God was bound to forgive him. Thus God would betray helplessness towards His own creatures" (*What Becomes of Our Dead?,* 61).

Bibliography: Arendzen, *Eternal Punishment;* Atzberger, *Geschichte der Christlichen Eschatologie;* Bremond, *La Catholique Conception de l'Enfer;* Carle, *Sur l'Enfer;* Kiefl, *Die Ewigkeit der Hölle;* Pohle, *Eschatology,* 45-74; Rickaby, *Hell;* Stufler, *Der Ewige Tod.* C. E. vii. 207-211.—C. W. xxvii. 321; lvii. 14.—D. Jan., 1881.—D. A. i. 1377-1399.—D. B. ii. 1792-1796.—D. T. v. 28-120; v. 2196-2239.—E. T. Dec. 15, 1893; May, July, 1904.—I. T. v. 64.

How can an infinitely good and merciful God condemn us whom He loves to the everlasting torments of Hell? Does not Hell imply a cruelty on God's part that we would hesitate to impute to the most heartless of men? Would a human father or mother so torment even a most worthless son? Does not Hell imply the final triumph of Satan over Christ the Redeemer?

Hell is indeed a great mystery, and, like every other mystery of Christianity, is infinitely beyond the scope of any finite mind. The Catholic knows it to be a dogma divinely revealed, and he accepts it humbly and without question on the word of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. As the Apostle says: "How incomprehensible are His judgments, and how unsearchable His ways" (Rom. xi. 33). Do scientists reject a known fact, simply because they are unable to explain it?

Is it honest for the unbeliever to ask in one breath: "How can a good God punish His creatures in Hell?," and in the next, "How can a world so full of wretchedness and misery be the creation of an infinitely wise and good God?" God is either too good or too evil, according as the unbeliever feels inclined to deny either Hell or Divine Providence. And yet in God all is one—His Mercy, Justice, Power and Love. It is only the limited character of our intellects that makes us set one attribute of God against the other. He cannot defeat His Mercy by His Justice, nor His Justice by His Mercy. He cannot deviate from the right without ceasing to be God. He is Justice; He is Mercy.

God could have created a world in which souls would have been so endowed with grace, that they would never have yielded to temptation. The saved souls in heaven are free, and yet they cannot sin. But in fact He did not create such a world.

The human race for thousands of years has yielded to temptation, and sinned grievously. God has offered us eternal happiness on the condition that we serve Him freely during the time of our probation. If, fully aware of this required service, and fully aware of his power to render it with the grace of God, a sinner deliberately refuse it, can he honestly call God unjust, for punishing him hereafter?

The Church always has taught that if a man is condemned to Hell, he certainly has deserved it. If he can say honestly I did not know God's law, or I could not help sinning, God cannot and will not punish him. For "God will have all men to be saved" (1 Tim. ii. 4). If a man dies with his will rebellious to God, *he puts himself in Hell.* Why blame God, when he alone is responsible?

I have met men who deliberately chose to corrupt the innocent, and have numbered their victims as sharpshooters in war time count their successful hits. I have known men who have deliberately broken up the happy home of a friend out of pure malice. I have known men who have defrauded minors out of every cent of their property. Can God, Jesus Christ, justly say to such men, if they die unrepentant: "Come ye blessed of My Father, possess the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world?" (Matt. xxv. 24.)

It is unfair to picture the unchangeable God gloating over the sufferings of souls in Hell, as if He were hardening His heart against their appeal for mercy and pardon. None of the lost have ever asked for mercy, and they never will. The will of the sinner in Hell is fixed in evil forever.

Satan would indeed triumph over Christ, if he could promise heaven to those who had led perfectly sinful lives. Hell implies his defeat, for it vindicates the supremacy of Christ and the divine law, which cannot be defied with impunity.

How could a good God predestine anyone to an eternal Hell? Does not this divine decree do away with our freedom of choice? If God foreknew that I was to be lost forever, why then did He create me?

The Catholic Church has never taught that God predestined anyone to Hell. On the contrary the Council of Trent (Sess. vi., can. 17) condemned the heresy of Calvin (*Inst.*, iii., chs. xxi., xxiii., xxiv.), who held that an absolute divine decree predestined part of mankind to Hell, and, in order to attain that end effectually, to sin. No intelligent man could worship a God who was the Author of evil, or a God who did away with our free will, thus making all merit or guilt on our part impossible. Such a repulsive doctrine explains why Puritan New England to-day is in great part Unitarian. Calvin's teaching, which many of his followers to-day reject as unreasonable, is plainly against the Scriptures, which insist upon God's mercy being ever ready to pardon the most hardened sinners (Rom. ii. 4; 2 Peter iii. 9), and which teach that Jesus Christ died for all men (2 Cor. v. 15; John i. 29; 1 John ii. 2), and that "God wills all men to be saved" (1 Tim. ii. 4).

God is the Eternal Present, the "I am who Am" (Exod. iii. 14); with Him there is no past, and no future. Omniscient, He must know all things. He knows the future even, therefore, before it happens; it does not happen because He foreknows it. He knows what we will do freely; His foreknowledge in no way affects our freedom of action.

In human affairs, we can easily realize that our foreknowledge

is in no way the cause of another's free action. For example, I warn a poor swimmer not to venture on a mile swim to a near-by island, or I warn a feeble old man not to cross a city street, until the signal lights order the autos to stop. If they refuse to heed my warning, I certainly do not feel in any way responsible for their deaths, although I foresaw them. In like manner God warns the sinner not to venture on the sea of grievous sin, and not to court the danger of temptation, for "he that loveth danger shall perish therein." Is God responsible for the sinner's eternal death, if he freely and deliberately choose to disobey His known commands?

You may tell me that the comparison is faulty—all comparisons are. You could not help your stubborn friends, whereas God could help the sinner by giving him more grace, so that he must needs repent. Why does He not do so? We cannot answer that question, for the distribution of God's graces is an impenetrable mystery. We are certain, however, that God gives every sinner sufficient grace for him to enter heaven, and that no one is lost save by his own fault.

The problem is well stated by Father Martindale, who writes: "This problem of God's having created such a world, despite His knowledge that man could and would, in it, misuse his opportunities and nature, concerns two liberties and their interaction; ours and God's. But not even our own liberty can we truly analyze. Of it we have a direct intuition, which is basic and cannot be set aside. Deny it, and every step forward in life denies your own denial. But it eludes adequate analysis. Still less is the liberty of God to be grasped by human intellect. It is in our liberty we most resemble God; and continue—baffling paradox—so to resemble Him precisely when and because we freely defy Him. . . . False is the problem that arises for us from a contradiction between two terms neither of which we fully understand, and, indeed, between those elements in them, precisely, which are those we do not understand. It may then be said that so terribly does God respect this transcendent fact of liberty, that His esteem for it outstrips His desire even for our happiness" (*God and the Supernatural,* 328).

Suppose for an instant that God could not create a soul whom He foresaw would be lost by the abuse of his free will, and his stubborn resisting of God's grace. It would follow then that every man, by the very fact of his creation and without any effort or striving on his part, would be infallibly certain of heaven. Virtue and vice then would be on a par. The moral law would then be without any sanction.

What does the Catholic Church teach regarding the torments of Hell?

The Catholic Church has defined nothing regarding the nature of the punishment the wicked undergo in Hell. Her theologians unanimously teach that the sinner suffers a two-fold punishment: the pain of loss, and the pain of sense. The pain of loss consists in the eternal separation of the sinner from God, and the realization that the failure to reach heaven is due to his own fault (Matt. xxv. 41; Luke xiii. 27; 1 Cor. vi. 9; Apoc. xxii. 15). This is the chief punishment of Hell, as the Fathers frequently teach. St. Augustine writes: "No torments known to us can be compared to it" (*Enchir.*, 112). St. John Chrysostom writes: "The fire of Hell is unbearable, and its torments awful But if you were to heap together a thousand Hell fires, it would be as nothing compared to the punishment of being excluded from the beatific glory of heaven, hated by Christ, and compelled to hear Him say, 'I know you not'" (*Hom. In Matt.*, xxiii., 8).

The pain of sense consists in the torment of fire, so often mentioned in the Scriptures (Matt. xiii. 30-50; xviii. 8; Mark ix. 42; Luke xvi. 24; 2 Thess. i. 8; Heb. x. 27; Apoc. xvii. 8; xix. 20). It is generally held that the fire of Hell, although a physical reality, is not a material fire like ours (St. Augustine, *De Gen. ad Lit.*, xii., 32; St. John Damascene, (*De Fide Orth.*, iv., 27). We know that until the General Judgment the lost souls will have no bodies, and after it their bodies will be such that no fire can destroy them. It is useless to speculate about its true nature, and more sensible to confess our ignorance in a question that evidently exceeds human understanding.

The body by itself is incapable of pain; it is the soul which suffers, inasmuch as it is the life principle of the body.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Arendzen, *What Becomes of Our Dead?;* Pohle, *Eschatology.*

Is it not unjust to punish a few years of sin with an eternity of punishment?

No, it is not unjust. The comparison should be made not between this short life of ours and eternity, but between a sinner eternally obdurate in sin and a God all Holy, "whose eyes are too pure to behold evil" (Habacuc i. 13).

Even if we had a thousand years of probation, would that in any way alter the problem? What indeed would ten thousand years be in comparison with eternity? In fact we should thank God that the time of our probation and danger is so short. We can make a definite choice of God in one minute, as many a death-bed repentance proves. God says to us: "I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing. Choose, therefore, life" (Deut. xxx. 19).

Is not a man punished enough in this life, without God putting him in Hell hereafter? Would not a limited punishment in the world to come be sufficient?

"It is not true," writes Balmes, "that the culprit experiences already in this life chastisement enough for his faults. Gnawing remorse indeed torments him; the infirmities produced by his irregularities grow on him, and the disastrous consequences of his perverse conduct weigh him down; but neither is he wanting in means to blunt the sharp sting of his conscience; neither is he devoid of artifices to neutralize the evil effects of his revels, nor short of resources to come clear out of the false positions in which his excesses have involved him" (*Letters to a Skeptic*, ch. iii.).

One of the proofs of immortality lies in the fact that the unpunished wickedness of many in this life, calls upon God to render just judgment upon them in the next. Our Lord teaches plainly that the wicked may be perfectly content in this life, but that punishment will await them hereafter. "Woe to you (wicked) rich, for you have your consolation" (Luke vi. 24). "Son, remember that thou didst receive good things in thy lifetime, and Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented" (Luke xvi. 25).

The sixteenth century Protestant contemptuously denied Purgatory, but insisted strongly on the torments of Hell. To-day his descendants reject Hell, and would have all after-death suffering purgatorial. Both denials are plain contradictions of the Scriptures and divine tradition. If God always forgave, even in the life to come, there would be no ultimate sanction of the moral law. A sinner could then continue sinning with the certainty that in the long run it would make no difference to him. Purgatory alone would inspire little or no terror in the average man.

Is not the doctrine of eternal punishment repugnant to the spirit of the age?

Yes, if by "the spirit of the age" you mean the spirit of modern unbelief, which denies the existence of a personal God, rejects the divinity of Christ and His Death for our sakes, questions the freedom of the will and the fact of sin, and sets at naught all divine authority, either in the Scriptures or divine tradition.

The tendency of modern States is to treat the criminal with greater indulgence, and, if he be wealthy or politically powerful, to allow him to escape the penalty his crimes deserve. No nation—and rightly—would tolerate to-day the fearful dungeons or cruel tortures that disgraced the nations of the past.

There are many too who argue strongly against all capital punishment, and look upon all penalties as merely corrective.

But the eternal law of God does not change with the changing laws of men. Hell is not a doctrine evolved out of an environment of severe and cruel human laws, but a dogma revealed by Jesus Christ, as the sanction and vindication of His eternal, moral law. Catholics will never discard it, or change the meaning of Christ's revelation, for the sake of the nerves of modern sentimentalists.

THE DESCENT INTO HELL

What is the meaning of the words of the Apostles' Creed, "He descended into Hell?" Did Christ really go to the Hell of the damned? What do Catholics mean by Limbo?

"We profess," says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "that immediately after the death of Christ His soul descended into Hell, and dwelt there as long as His body remained in the tomb; and also that the one Person of Christ was at the same time in Hell and in the sepulchre. . . . Hell here signifies those secret abodes in which are detained the souls that have not obtained the happiness of heaven" (Callan-McHugh (ed.), *The Catechism of the Council of Trent*, 62, 63).

This doctrine, which was defined by the Fourth Lateran Council, is explicitly taught in the Scriptures. "Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the sorrows of Hell, as it was impossible that He should be holden by it" (Acts ii. 24; *Cf.* 31). "Now that He ascended, what is it, but because He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth" (Eph. iv. 9). "In which also coming He preached to those spirits that were in prison" (1 Peter iii. 19).

Our Lord Himself frequently refers to this Limbo of the Fathers, where the just were detained until Ascension Day, under the figure of a banquet (Matt. viii. 11), or of a marriage feast (Matt. xxv. 10). He also calls it "Abraham's bosom" in His parable of Lazarus and Dives (Luke xvi. 22), and "paradise" in addressing the penitent thief on the Cross (Luke xxiii. 43). Once Christ appeared, the just souls began to enjoy the Beatific Vision, and Limbo was at once changed into heaven.

The Limbo of the Children means the state of natural happiness enjoyed by those who die in original sin, without ever having been guilty of grievous personal sin. St. Thomas holds

that the children there enjoy a positive happiness, being united to God by a knowledge and love proportionate to their capacity (*De Malo,* art. iii.).

Bibliography: D. T. iv. 565-619.

HEAVEN

Is Heaven a place or a state of the soul? What do we really know about Heaven? Will we know our relatives and friends there?

Heaven is both the eternal happiness and the eternal dwelling place of the just in the life to come. It is called the kingdom of heaven (Matt. v. 3), the kingdom of God (Mark ix. 46), the kingdom of the Father (Matt. xiii. 43), the kingdom of Christ (Luke xxii. 30), the city of God (Heb. xii. 22), paradise (2 Cor. xii. 4), life everlasting (Matt. xix. 16), the crown of life (James i. 12), of justice (2 Tim. iv. 8), of glory (1 Peter v. 4), and our eternal inheritance (Heb. ix. 15).

The supernatural happiness of Heaven consists in the intuitive vision of the Divine Essence. "Now we see in a mirror, obscurely; but then face to face. Now I know in part; then I shall know fully, even as I have been fully known" (1 Cor. xiii. 12). This doctrine was defined by Benedict XII in 1336, and by the Council of Florence in 1439. To enable the intellect to see God, it is supernaturally perfected by *the light of glory,* as the Council of Vienne defined in 1311.

No one can enter Heaven unless he is free of sin (Apoc. xxi. 27), in the state of justice and friendship of God. Its supreme happiness excludes all evil, physical or moral. "And God shall wipe away every tear from their eyes, and death shall be no more, neither shall mourning or wailing or pain be any more, because the first things are passed away" (Apoc. xxi. 4; *Cf.* vii. 16).

The eternal happiness of Heaven (Luke xii. 33; xvi. 9; 1 Peter v. 4; 2 Peter i. 11) admits of various degrees. "He who soweth sparingly, shall also reap sparingly; and he who soweth in blessings, shall also reap blessings" (2 Cor. ix. 6; *Cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 41; John xiv. 2).

The soul's intimacy with God in Heaven, its relationship with the saints, its immunity from sin, are joys that the human mind cannot grasp. "Eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, what things God hath prepared for them that love Him" (1 Cor. ii. 9; Ps. xxv. 9; Isa. lxiv. 4).

We shall certainly know our relatives and friends in Heaven, and know them more intimately and love them more ardently

than we did upon earth. One of man's greatest joys here is the love of kinsfolk and friends. God will supernaturalize this affection, but He will not destroy it. Everything in Heaven is supernatural, but not unnatural. Love and friendship on earth are frail things at best, and no quarrels are greater than quarrels among kinsfolk. In the hereafter, when all souls are confirmed in sanctity, the natural affections of the human heart will be intensified and increased a hundredfold. We will love our own in God and for God.

Bibliography: Arendzen, *The Church Triumphant;* Blot, *In Heaven We Know Our Own;* Cabrol, *La Prière Antique;* Martin, *La Vie Future;* Schneider, *The Other Life;* Vaughan, *Life Everlasting; Life After Death;* Vonier, *The Life of the World to Come.* D. A. i. 531.—D. T. ii. 2474-2511.

How could a man be happy in Heaven, if he knew that his dearly beloved relatives and friends were in Hell forever?

Heaven consists in the Beatific Vision, which implies that the saints view everything from the viewpoint of God. The sufferings of the lost in Hell can no more interfere with our happiness in Heaven than they interfere with the happiness of God. In this life it is natural that we should be most unhappy at the thought of anyone being condemned to Hell. That is why saintly men and women devote their lives to the service of their brethren, striving to win sinners to God by their prayers and their many works of charity.

But in the life to come our feelings must necessarily undergo a change. We will no more sympathize with the lost than we sympathize with the devils; we will realize that they were condemned justly after having refused every proferred grace of God. We will realize that they hate God with an eternal hatred, and that their sins have driven out of their souls everything that on earth made them loveable.

What is the meaning of the words: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My word shall not pass away" (Mark xiii. 31)?

The meaning of the Savior's words are clear. He had been speaking of the future destruction of the temple of Jerusalem, and the end of the world. He then adds that, whereas this world and all earthly things are perishable, His gospel is eternal. The same idea is expressed by the prophet Isaias: "The heavens shall vanish like smoke, and the earth shall be worn away like a garment, and the inhabitants thereof shall perish in like manner. But My salvation shall be forever, and My justice shall not fail" (Isa. li. 6; *Cf.* liv. 10).

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS

What is meant by "the Communion of Saints"?

The Communion of Saints is the spiritual union which unites the faithful upon earth, the souls in Purgatory, and the saints in Heaven in the one Mystical Body, the Church, of which Jesus Christ is the Head, and the participation of all in the one supernatural life. The saints by their closeness to God obtain of Him many graces and favors for the faithful on earth and the souls in Purgatory; the faithful on earth by their prayers and good works honor and love the saints, and succor the suffering souls by their prayers, and the holy sacrifice of the Mass.

The Gospels on every page speak of the kingdom of God as a divine, spiritual kingdom established by Christ (Matt. iii. 2; xii. 28; Mark i. 5; Luke xvii. 20), and united in the bond of charity (Matt. iii. 11; v. 48; Luke xii. 49). It embraces all the elect on earth and in heaven, even the angels (Matt. xix. 29; Apoc. xxi. 10-27). St. John speaks of this Communion as "the fellowship with us, and our fellowship with the Father, and His Son, Jesus Christ" (1 John i. 3). St. Paul speaks of it as the Mystical Body of Christ, of which all the faithful are members (Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 12, 27; Eph. i. 22; Col. i. 18; ii. 19; iii. 15). All share in the same spiritual blessings (1 Cor. xii. 13; Eph. ii. 13-20), merits (Rom. xii. 4-6; 1 Cor. xii. 25; Eph. iv. 3, 7-13), and prayers (Rom. i. 9; xv. 30; Phil. i. 3-5; Col. iv. 12).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Kirsch, *The Communion of Saints.* D. T. iii. 480-574.

PURGATORY

Where do you find Purgatory or praying for the dead in the Bible? Did primitive Christianity believe in an intermediate state? Is it not more reasonable to suppose that at death a man goes directly to Heaven or to Hell?

The Catholic Church has defined the existence of Purgatory in the Decree of Union drawn up at the Council of Florence in 1439, and again at the Council of Trent (Sess. xxv.) which says: "The Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Ghost, has from Sacred Scriptures and the ancient traditions of the Fathers, taught in Sacred Councils, and very recently in this Ecumenical Synod (Sess. vi., can. 30; Sess. xxii., chs. 2, 3), that there is a

Purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but principally by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar."

The same Council taught (Sess. xiv., can. 12), in accordance with the Scriptures (Num. xx. 12; 2 Kings xii. 13, 14) that God does not always remit all of the temporal punishment due to forgiven sin. The Scriptures teach that nothing defiled can enter heaven (Wisd. vii. 25; Isa. xxv. 8; Hab. i. 13; Apoc. xxi. 7), and that Christians often die with venial sins upon their souls. All, therefore, who die in venial sins, or with the temporal punishment of their sins still unpaid must atone for them in Purgatory.

The teaching of the Old Testament is found in 2 Machabees xii. 43-46. After Judas had defeated Gorgias, he came with his company to bury the Jews who had been slain in the conflict. He found under their coats some of the donaries, *i. e.*, votive offerings, which they had, contrary to the Law (Deut. vii. 25), robbed from the idols of Jamnia. Judas at once prayed God that their sin might be forgiven (xii. 37-42), and "making a gathering, he sent twelve drachms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead." He did not consider their sins grievous, "because he considered that they who had fallen asleep with godliness had great grace laid up for them." The sacred writer then adds: "It is, therefore, a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins" (xii. 43-46).

It is true that Protestants consider the books of Machabees apocryphal, but they rest upon the same authority as Isaias or St. John—the divine infallible witness of the Catholic Church. Even prescinding from the fact of their inspiration, we may cite them as an historical witness of the Jewish belief centuries before Christ.

Our Lord speaks of the forgiveness of sins in "the world to come" (Matt. xii. 32), which refers to Purgatory according to St. Augustine (*De Civ. Dei.*, xxi., 24) and St. Gregory the Great *Dial.*, iv., 39). St. Paul, speaking of slight sins to be burned away and the "soul saved so as by fire" (1 Cor. iii. 11-15), refers to Purgatory according to Origen (Hom., vi., *Exod.*), St. Jerome (*In Amos*, iv.), St. Ambrose (Ser. xx., *In Ps.*, cxvii.) and St. Augustine (*In Ps.*, xxvii.).

All the Fathers of both East and West mention the Apostolic custom of praying for the dead. Tertullian (160-240) speaks of anniversary Masses in two different passages: "We make on one day every year oblations for the dead, as for their birthdays" (*De Cor. Mil.*, 3). "The faithful widow prays for the soul of her husband, and begs for him in the interim repose, and participation in the first resurrection, and offers on the anniversary

of his death" (*De Monag.,* 10). St. Cyprian (200-258) decreed that no oblation or sacrifice was to be offered up for a priest who had acted as executor (*Epis.* lxvi.).

St. Ambrose (340-397) in his funeral sermon over the Emperor Theodosius, said: "Give perfect rest to Thy servant Theodosius, that rest which Thou has prepared for Thy saints. . . . I have loved him, and therefore will I follow him unto the land of the living; nor will I leave him until by tears and prayers I shall lead him whither his merits summon him, unto the holy mountain of the Lord" (*De Obitu. Theod.,* 36, 37).

St. Augustine (354-430) writes: "Lay," she says (his mother, Monica), "this body anywhere; let not the care of it in any way disturb you. Only this I ask of you, that you remember me at the altar of the Lord, wherever you are" (*Conf.,* ix., 27).

St. Cyril of Jerusalem (315-386) writes: "Then we pray for the holy Fathers and Bishops who have fallen asleep before us, and for all who have died in our communion, believing that the souls for whom prayers are offered receive very great assistance, while the holy and most awful sacrifice lies to open view" (*Cath. Myst.,* v., 9).

St. John Chrysostom (344-407) writes: "Not in vain are oblations made on behalf of the departed; not in vain supplications; not in vain alms" (*Act. Apost.,* xxi., 4).

All the ancient liturgies of both East and West (Duchesne, *Christian Worship;* Cabrol, *Le Livre de la Prière Antique,* ch. xxxiii.) contain prayers for the dead. The prayer of the Roman liturgy runs as follows: "Be mindful, O Lord, of Thy servants *N.* and *N.,* who are gone before us with the sign of faith, and sleep in the sleep of peace. Grant, we beseech Thee, O Lord, a place of refreshment, light and peace, through the same Christ our Lord." The phrase "refreshment, light and peace" is found in many of the Catacomb inscriptions. The formula *In Pace* (In Peace) like our modern *Requiescat in Pace* (May he or she rest in peace), and the words, "mayest thou have eternal light in Christ," and "may God refresh you," are found over many a Christian's tomb in the first three centuries (Wilpert, *Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms;* Barnes, *The Early Church in the Light of the Monuments,* 149-157).

It is indeed strange that the Reformers should set aside such a body of testimony, both in Scripture and tradition, for Purgatory and prayers for the dead. But doctrine is so interwoven with doctrine in the consistent Gospel of Jesus Christ, that the denial of one central dogma logically means the denial of many others. Luther's false theory of justification by faith alone led him to deny the distinction between mortal and venial sin, the fact of temporal punishment, the necessity of good works, the efficacy of indulgences, and the usefulness of prayers for the dead. If sin

is not remitted, but only covered; if the "new man" of the Gospel is Christ imputing His own justice to the still sinful man, it would indeed be useless to pray for the dead that they be loosed from their sins. Luther's denial of Purgatory implied either the cruel doctrine that the greater number of even devout Christians were lost, which accounts in some measure for the modern denial of eternal punishment, or the unwarranted assumption that God by "some sudden, magical change" purifies the soul at the instant of death (Möhler, *Symbolism,* i., iii., xxiii.); Oxenham, *Eschatology,* i., 26-40).

The Catholic doctrine is most reasonable. It follows logically from the fact that many die with the burden of venial sins on their conscience, or die with the temporal punishment due to their forgiven sins still unpaid. The average Christian commits many a venial sin in his lifetime, for which he never craves pardon. The sinner of many years standing, who in God's mercy is pardoned on his deathbed, must in the hereafter, unless given a plenary indulgence, satisfy to the last farthing his debt of temporal punishment.

Even the pagan philosopher, Plato, made a distinction between *curable* and *incurable* offences to be punished hereafter—the one for a time, and the other forever. He writes: "But those that are benefited, at the same time that they suffer punishment both from gods and men, are such as have been guilty of *curable* offences; their benefit, both here and in Hades, accrues to them through means of pain and torments; for it is not possible to be freed from injustice in any other way" (Gorgias, *Cary's translation,* i., 230).

I have more than once met Protestants—even Lutherans —who admitted to me that they prayed for their dead, despite the teaching of their ministers, on the principle that their beloved dead were neither bad enough for Hell nor good enough for Heaven. I recall especially a Lutheran woman in Baltimore, who prayed daily for her husband. She had never read a line of St. Augustine, and probably never had heard his name. Yet out of the natural instinct of her heart she knew his teaching, *viz.*, that "there are some who have departed this life, not so bad as to be deemed unworthy of mercy, nor so good as to be entitled to immediate happiness" (*De Civ. Dei.,* xxi., 24).

The reasonableness of the Church tradition doctrine has been admitted by honest non-Catholics. Mallock writes: "It is becoming fast recognized that it (Purgatory) is the only doctrine that can bring a belief in future rewards and punishments into anything like accordance with our notions of what is just and reasonable. So far from its being a superfluous superstition, it is seen to be just what is demanded at once by reason and morality; and a belief in it is not an intellectual assent only,

but a partial harmonizing of the whole moral ideal" (*Is Life Worth Living?*, xi., 290).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bautz, *Das Fegfeuer;* Canty, *Purgatory;* Fortescue, *The Orthodox Eastern Church,* 388; Rouzic, *Le Purgatoire;* Schmid, *Das Fegfeuer;* Shepherd, *The Church Suffering;* Tapperhorn, *Das Fegfeuer;* Thurston, *In Memory of Our Dead.* C. E. xii. 575-580.—D. A. iv. 495-527.—D. T. v. 2246-2261.

THE FIRST COMMANDMENT
(Prayer)

Why do Christians pray to God to inform Him of what He already knows? Does He not appreciate their needs without their informing Him in wordy petitions?

We do not pray to inform God of our needs, or to instruct Him what to do, for the All-Knowing God knows the inmost secret of every heart, and all its needs. We pray to God, because we desire to acknowledge His Power and Goodness, because we feel our utter dependence upon Him, and because He Himself taught us to pray by word and by example.

Jesus Christ taught us to hallow God's name, and to do God's will perfectly on earth as it is done in heaven; He taught us to pray for temporal and spiritual favors, such as the grace to overcome temptation, the forgiveness of our sins, and the grace of final perseverance (Matt. vi. 9-13; Luke xi. 1-4). He promised to receive our prayer when it came from a loving heart (Matt. v. 23, 24), saying to us: "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and you shall find; knock, and it shall be opened to you" (Matt. vii. 7). For "if you know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Father from heaven give the good Spirit to them that ask Him?" (Luke xi. 1, 13.) And again: "Whatsoever you shall ask the Father in My name, that will I do. . . . If you shall ask Me anything in My name, that I will do" (John xiv. 13, 14).

He began His public ministry with a forty days' prayer (Mark i. 35); He spent whole nights in prayer (Luke vi. 12); He prayed when He performed miracles (Matt. xiv. 19; John xi. 42); He prayed in His agony in the Garden (Matt. xxvi. 39-41), and on the Cross for Himself and for His executioners (Matt. xxvii. 46; Luke xxiii. 34, 46).

"Pray without ceasing," urges St. Paul (1 Thess. v. 17) against the enemies of your salvation (2 Cor. xii. 27; Eph. vi. 11-17). The whole Christian life is a prayer of union with Christ in His Mystical Body (1 Cor. xii., 27; 2 Cor. v. 17; Eph. ii. 10-15).

Prayer is communing or conversing with God. as St. Gregory

of Nyssa says (*De Orat. Dom*). We not only ask God for favors, as He Himself taught us to do, but we adore Him, praise Him, thank Him for His favors, and ask Him pardon for our sins.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: D'Hulst, *Conferences de Notre Dame,* 1893; McNabb, *Oxford Conferences on Prayer;* Sertillanges, *La Prière.* A. Q. 1888, 491.—C. E. xii. 345-350.

Does not prayer imply a continual change on the part of the unchangeable God?

It does not. St. Thomas thus answers this question: "In order to throw light on this question (of the utility of prayer) we must consider that Divine Providence disposes not only what effects shall take place, but also from what causes and in what order these effects shall proceed. Now among other causes human acts are the causes of certain effects. Wherefore it must be that men do certain actions, not that thereby they may change the Divine disposition, but that by those actions they may achieve certain effects according to the order of the Divine disposition; and the same is to be said of natural causes. And so it is with regard to prayer. For we pray, not that we may change the Divine disposition, but that we may impetrate that which God has disposed to be fulfilled by our prayers, in other words "that by asking, men may deserve to receive what Almighty God from eternity has disposed to give," as St. Gregory (*Dial.*, i.) says.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Summa,* IIa. IIae., Q. 83, art. 2.

ANSWERS TO PRAYERS

Why are not all our prayers answered, as the Lord promised (John xiv. 13)?

If we pray humbly (Ps. i. 19; Ecclus. xxv. 21; Luke xi. 5-8) and perseveringly (Matt. xv. 22-28; Luke xi. 5-8, 9-13; xviii. 1-7 for spiritual blessings that will ensure our soul's salvation,—the grace to resist temptation, the pardon of sin, and the grace of final perseverance,—God will infallibly answer us.

If we ask spiritual blessings for others, God will pour forth His grace in abundant measure, but the sinner we pray for may resist God's grace even to the end. God will never force the human will, for He demands a free, not a forced service.

If we pray for temporal blessings, such as health, success, and fortune, God may grant our prayer by denying us what we ask. We must always pray in accordance with the divine plan. Our Lord gave us the example in the Garden of Gethsemani, when He prayed: "My Father, if it be possible, let this chalice pass from Me. Nevertheless not as I will, but as Thou wilt"

(Matt. xxvi. 39). St. Paul's prayer to be freed from the sting of the flesh was not granted him, because "God's power is made perfect in infirmity" (2 Cor. xii. 7, 9).

If sickness were to bring us close to God, and health make us forgetful of Him; if failure were to humble us, and success puff us up with pride and arrogance; if poverty were to make us followers of the poor Christ (2 Cor. viii. 9), and riches cause us to abandon the faith, ought not God in His mercy and love refuse us what we in our ignorance crave? A loving mother will not give her child her husband's razor to play with, no matter how hard he cries for it. A good physician will not grant a change of diet to his patient, if he knows he is thereby causing his death.

Bibliography: Basevi, *Unanswered Prayers.*

THE ENDING OF THE LORD'S PRAYER

Why do not Catholics say the Lord's Prayer in full? I notice that they omit the words: "For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever. Amen" (Matt. vi. 13)?

Catholics say the Lord's Prayer as the Lord Himself taught it to His Apostles. The words cited above from the King James Version are a marginal gloss, interpolated by some copyist, who had in mind words borrowed from the Greek liturgy (*Cf.* 1 Par. xxix. 11). They were rejected as unauthentic by St. Jerome in the fourth century, as they have been rejected by the authors of the Revised Version of 1881. Even the King James Version omits this gloss in Luke xi. 4.

HOW TO PRAY

Why do not Catholics pray as the heart dictates, instead of always repeating a number of set prayers? Did the early Christians have set prayers which they read out of a book, as you priests do at Mass?

In Apostolic times the Mass prayers were not all written down and read from a missal as the priest does to-day, but they were in part composed by the officiating Bishop. But it is generally admitted by liturgical scholars that the set prayers of the liturgy go back as early as the second century. Our Lord had told His Apostles to do what He did at the Last Supper (Luke xxii. 19), so that His words of Consecration were naturally repeated in every Mass from the beginning, as we read in St. Justin Martyr (*Apol.*, i., 65). The lessons, psalms, prayers, and preaching which accompanied these sacred words were really a

Christianized form of the synagogue service. St. Paul mentions readings from the Scriptures (1 Tim. iv. 13; Col. iv. 16; 1 Thess. v. 27), the recitation of psalms and hymns (1 Cor. xiv. 26; Col. iii. 16; Eph. v. 19), the answering of Amen (1 Cor. xiv. 16), and St. Luke the prayers which followed the Consecration (Acts ii. 42).

When one of the disciples said to Christ: "Lord, teach us to pray," He answered the request by teaching us the most perfect set prayer, the Lord's Prayer (Luke xi. 1). The Catholic Church, therefore, merely follows His divine example, when she approves the many prayers in honor of the Lord, the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, such as the Creed, the Confiteor, the Hail Mary, the Angelus, the Rosary.

But Catholics may also pray as the heart dictates, making profession of their faith, hope, love, and sorrow for sin. The Church has always approved Mental Prayer, whereby the soul is brought in union with Christ by offering to Him acts of adoration, and love, prompted by the thought of some doctrine or some fact of divine revelation.

Besides Vocal and Mental Prayer, there is the Contemplative Prayer of the mystics, described in the writings of saints like St. Teresa, St. Catherine of Siena, St. John of the Cross, or St. Peter of Alcantara. St. John of the Cross speaking of this most perfect prayer writes: "The soul must be attached to nothing, not even to the subject of its meditation, not to sensible or spiritual sweetness, because God requires a spirit so free, so annihilated, that every act of the soul, even of thought, of liking or disliking, will impede and disturb it, and break that profound silence of sense and spirit necessary for hearing the deep and delicate voice of God, who speaks to the soul in solitude" (*The Living Flame of Love*, 6).

If our questioner would see how opposed the Catholic Church is to the formalism he condemns, he ought to read the writings of the Church's mystics. The love of God breathes in every page of *The Interior Castle* of St. Teresa, *The Ascent of Mount Carmel* of St. John of the Cross, and the *Introduction to a Devout Life* of St. Francis de Sales.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Baker, *Contemplative Prayer; Holy Wisdom;* Bellord, *Meditations on Dogma;* De Besse, *The Science of Prayer;* Bruyére, *Spiritual Life and Prayer;* Caussade, *Progress in Prayer;* Charles, *Prayers for All Times;* Devas, *Mental Prayer;* Hilton, *The Scale of Perfection;* Jarrett, *Meditations for Layfolk;* Newman, *Meditations and Devotions;* Poulain, *The Graces of Interior Prayer;* Pourrat, *Christian Spirituality;* Saudreau, *The Degrees of the Spiritual Life; The Mystical State; The Life of Union With God;* St. Ignatius, *The Spiritual Exercises;* St. Alphonsus Liguori, *Prayer;* St. Peter of Alcantara, *Prayer and Meditation.* C. E. xii. 345-350.—D. A. iv. 270-361.

MEDALS

Is not the wearing of medals a superstitious practice, akin to the pagan custom of wearing amulets or charms to ward off disease and danger?

No, there is no superstition in the wearing of medals. The pagans attributed to the amulets they wore a magical power to ward off disease and death. Catholics wear medals to honor God and His saints, to bring to their minds some doctrine of the faith, or to attest their membership in some pious confraternity. They do not attribute any virtue to the medal itself, but they wear it to foster devotion. Would you call a man superstitious, because he wore a locket containing the portrait of his wife? Would you find fault with a soldier, who wore a medal given him for some special act of bravery?

One of the oldest medals in existence is a bronze medallion of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, discovered in the cemetery of Domitilla, and ascribed by De Rossi to the time of Alexander Severus (222-235). Many of the gilded glasses of the Catacombs contain portraits of Moses, Tobias, the Blessed Virgin and St. Agnes.

The medieval "pilgrims' signs," worn upon the hat or breast, were often in the form of medals. The author of *Piers the Plowman* mentions the ampulles of Canterbury, the tokens of Assisi, the scallop-shells of St. James of Compostella, and the keys of St. Peter.

Modern medals of devotion became popular in the fifteenth century, when the papal Jubilee medals were spread all over Europe; a century later the Popes gave them special blessings, and enriched them with many indulgences.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Northcote-Brownlow, *Roma Sotterranea,* 298-324, De Rossi, *Roma Sotterranea.* C. E. x. 111-115.

ASTROLOGY

Why does the Catholic Church condemn astrology? Is it sinful to have one's horoscope taken?

The Catholic Church condemns astrology as a pagan superstition, which by encouraging fatalism leads to the denial of Divine Providence. The stars exercise no influence whatever upon human life and human affairs, and the casting of a horoscope or diagram of the heavens at the birth of a child in order to foretell its future is downright folly. St. Augustine at-

tacked it strongly in his *City of God* (viii., 19), and St. Thomas writes: "If anyone applies the observation of the stars in order to foreknow casual or fortuitous events, or to know with certitude future human actions, his conduct is based on a false and vain opinion; and so the operation of the demon introduces himself therein, wherefore it will be a superstitious and unlawful divination" (*Summa,* IIa. IIæ., Q. 95, art. 5).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Windle, *Religions Past and Present,* xiii.

SPIRITISM

Does the Catholic Church allow a Catholic to attend a Spiritistic séance or to become a Medium? Is not Spiritism invaluable in supplying us with a certain proof of immortality?

No, the Catholic Church forbids Catholics to have anything to do with Spiritism, which she condemns as a superstition, destructive alike of morals and religion. The Holy Office has issued at least five decrees (1840, 1847, 1856, 1898, 1917) forbidding Catholics "to be present at spiritistic communications and manifestations of every kind, with or without a Medium, even though they appear to be good and honest; either by interrogating souls or spirits, or hearing their answers, or by simply looking on, even though one tacitly or expressly protests that he does not wish to have anything to do with evil spirits" (April 24, 1917). The Second Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1866 pointed out clearly the anti-Christian character of Spiritism, and forbade Catholics to attend Spiritistic séances.

Spiritism is simply a modern form of the pagan necromancy condemned by the law of Moses. "Neither let there be found among you anyone that consulteth soothsayers . . . or *that seeketh the truth from the dead*" (Deut. xviii. 10; *Cf.* Exod. xxii. 18; Lev. xix. 31; xx. 6, 27; Isa viii. 19).

While pretending to be a "new revelation," Spiritism is a pagan superstition, which denies every dogma of the Christian Gospel in the name of an imagined communion with the dead—a cruel parody of the Communion of Saints. Its God is either an impersonal World-Soul, or a vague Unknowable, whom we must not worship, and to whom we must not pray. Its Christ is a purely human Medium, a great spirit, who did not die on the Cross for man's salvation, because the fall of man is a "baseless figment," and sin in the Christian sense an absurdity. Death is not the end of our probation as the Scriptures teach but the beginning of our education and development on one of the spirit spheres. The future life is pictured, not as eternal

happiness in the face to face vision of God, but either as a purely mental state, or as a life akin to ours even to the drinking of a brandy and soda, as Oliver Lodge's son informs us (Lodge, *Raymond*). Hell is dismissed as "odious," "unreasonable" and "contrary to common sense," a logical enough position once the idea of God is perverted, and the sense of sin destroyed.

The immorality of Spiritism lies in the fact that it is a gross superstition against the virtue of religion, explicitly attributing to creatures a knowledge of the future life, which can come only from God. The experience of the past eighty years has proved conclusively that Spiritism is attended with many dangers both to body and soul; it has frequently destroyed the physical health of its adepts, unbalanced their minds, and deprived them of the true faith.

The phenomena of Spiritism, physical and psychical, are most numerous and extraordinary,—the movement of inanimate objects without contact, apports, levitation, materialization, spirit photography, table-rapping in answer to questions, automatic- and slate-writing, clairvoyance, and the like. We grant that these phenomena are often inexplicable, but the spiritistic hypothesis has never been demonstrated. Apart from fraud which is seldom absent, we may explain these phenomena by telepathy, the sitters unconsciously voicing through the medium their emotions or thoughts; or by diabolism, evil spirits using the medium as a means of undermining the morals or of destroying the faith of the curious and the unthinking.

The immortality of the soul is a postulate of reason and a dogma of the Catholic faith. Spiritism in no way proves immortality, for despite its exaggerated claims, it has never in one instance proved spirit identity. The doctrine of immortality certainly receives no support from the hypotheses of telepathy or diabolism.

Bibliography: Blackmore, *Spiritism;* Brownson, *The Spirit Rapper;* Lepicier, *The Unseen World;* Liljencrants, *Spiritism and Religion;* Lapponi, *Hypnotism and Spiritism;* Miller, *Sermons on Modern Spiritism;* Raupert, *Modern Spiritism; The Dangers of Spiritism; The New Black Magic; Christ and the Powers of Darkness;* Roure, *Le Spiritisme; Au pays de l'Occultisme;* Thurston, *Modern Spiritism.* A. Q. 1882, 208, 518; 1883, 153.—C. W. cxxiv. 203; cx. 48.—D. Oct., 1909; July, 1919; April, 1923.—E. April, Sept., 1920.—M. Feb., March, 1923; Oct., 1922; April, 1924.—R. C. xxxi. 273.—T. March 17, 1923.

THE OUIJA-BOARD

Is it a sin to use the Ouija-Board?

It is not sinful if one regards the Ouija-Board as a plaything, and believe that its message is produced merely by the

unconscious movements of the one operating it. But it is sinful, if one takes the answers seriously, and superstitiously consults the planchette as he would consult a fortune teller. Raupert testifies to its use by evil spirits, and quotes Dr. Carrington with regard to its harmful effects. He writes: "Sometimes a message is jerked in here and there, which is often seen at once to be no part of the experimenter's mental outfit. Events taking place at a distance are accurately reported and commented upon. Disclosures are made respecting the character, doings and intimate affairs of persons not known to the experimenter." The present writer has come across Catholics who were physical and mental wrecks from the long-continued practice of automatic writing, that began with their playful use of the Ouija-Board.

Bibliography: Raupert, *The New Black Magic;* Carrington, *The Problems of Psychical Research.* E. Nov., 1918.

HYPNOTISM

Does the Catholic Church allow hypnotic treatment for the curing of disease? When it first appeared did not some theologians falsely declare it diabolic?

Yes, the Church permits the use of hypnotism for grave cause, when there is no danger either of superstition or scandal. It is true that a few theologians declared hypnotism essentially immoral and diabolical (Franco, Claverie and Bishop Hervas), but the vast majority have ever followed the decisions of the Roman Congregation on this matter—D'Annibale, Berardi, Coconnier, Genicot, Lemkuhl, Nolden, Prummer.

The Holy Office, June 2, 1840, declared: "The use of magnetism, *i. e.,* the mere act of employing physical means otherwise permissible, is not morally forbidden, provided that it does not tend to an illicit end, or one which may be in any manner evil." Again in reply, July 26, 1899, to a physician, who asked whether he could use suggestion in curing children, the Holy Office decreed that "it was permissible, provided there was no danger of superstition or scandal."

Hypnotism has been used to good effect by physicians in curing certain nervous diseases, and in inducing anæsthesia; by physicians, parents and teachers in curing the evil habits of depraved children, and the alcoholism and morphinomania of adults. Its rare use by judges to elicit confessions from criminals and witnesses has been rightly discredited as utterly untrustworthy, and by artists to secure immobility in their models as generally harmful.

All admit that hypnotism is attended with many dangers, physical, psychical and moral.

It has been the cause of epilepsy, hysteria and insanity; it has been the occasion of immoral imaginings and criminal actions, especially when the hypnotizer was an unskilled person, or a wicked charlatan. That is why many countries abroad have prohibited all public séances, for example, Prussia, Austria, Switzerland, Denmark, France and Portugal. In view of these dangers Catholic moralists allow the use of hypnotism only for grave cause, and insist strongly upon the operator being scientifically able and morally trustworthy. To offset the moral dangers, they require the presence of a third party—parent, husband, or friend.

Forty years ago hypnotism was very much to the fore. The schools of Paris and Nancy were sending their graduates all over Europe, and great hopes were entertained for this new therapeutic agent. But there are fashions in medicine as in dress. To-day most physicans and surgeons ignore it altogether, and dismiss the claims of its first defenders—Charcot, Bernheim, Liébeault, Moll, Wetterstrand—as false and exaggerated.

Bibliography: Coconnier, *L'Hpynotisme Franc;* Laponni, *Hypnotism and Spiritism;* Maher, *Psychology;* Meric, *Le Merveilleux et la Science;* O'Malley-Walsh, *Essays in Pastoral Medicine.* C. W. l. 574; lii. 837.—D. April, 1891.—D. T. vi. 357-365.—E. iii. 257; xii. 120; Oct., 1890; Jan., Feb., 1895.—R. C. i. 562; xii. 253.

PSYCHOANALYSIS

How do Catholic moralists regard Psychoanalysis?

Catholic philosophy negatives *in toto* the pagan creed of the modern psychoanalyst, *viz.,* the omnipotence of the unconscious. Psychoanalysis destroys the unity of the human personality, and makes the continuity of consciousness impossible. Free will becomes a delusion, moral responsibility an impossibility, and sin non-existent. Man is no longer master of his soul; it has become the mere battleground for the struggle of abnormal, primitive passions and urges, seeking boldly for expression. Such a teaching is a mere pagan parody of the Catholic doctrine of the Fall and Original Sin, and a failure to realize the Christian teaching of the law of the members, which fights continually against the law of the mind (Rom. vii. 23).

Its theory of dream symbolism is unnatural and unreal; its office of an unconscious censorship is unscientific and fanciful; its identifying of religious ideas with sex symbols is atheistic; its transference of the discovered complex is fruitful of im-

morality; its usurpation of the office of priest-confessor often destroys the moral and religious life of the individual.

Is it not strange that the very men and women who reject the Catholic confessional as an intolerable burden, do not scruple to reveal the inmost secrets of their sex-life to a psychoanalyst, who has no training whatever to serve as their spiritual guide?

Dr. Bruehl well says: "If such a philosophy became universally accepted, life would lose its value, the world its charm, religion its dignity, morality its majesty, and art its fascination" (*Psychoanalysis,* 23).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: D. April, 1921.

DREAMS

If it is superstitious to believe in dreams, why does God make use of dreams to make known His will to men, both in the Old Testament and the New?

It is indeed superstitious to guide our conduct by dreams, for generally speaking a rightly instructed conscience should be our guide. The Scriptures frequently tell us "not to observe dreams," and teach clearly that "dreams have deceived many, and they have failed that put their trust in them" (Lev. xix. 26; Deut. xviii. 10; Ecclus. xxxiv. 7; *Cf.* Jer. xxiii. 22; Zach. x. 2). On the other hand, the Scriptures mention dreams as a means of divine revelation, as in the dreams of Abimelech, Jacob, Solomon, Nabuchodonosor, Daniel, St. Joseph and St. Paul (Gen. xxviii. 12; xxxi. 10; 3 Kings iii. 5-15; Dan. ii. 19; vii. 1; Matt. i. 20; ii. 13; Acts xxiii. 11; xxvii. 23). Dreams of themselves have ordinarily a natural cause. When they come from God, He always takes good care to make their supernatural character evident.

ORDEALS

Why were the medieval Popes so remiss in allowing for centuries the cruel, unjust and superstitious trials by ordeal?

The Roman tribunals never permitted trials by ordeal, and the Popes from the ninth century did their utmost to abolish this unjust and superstitious custom. The peoples of Northern Europe had inherited trials by ordeal from their pagan ancestors,

and on their conversion demanded the intervention of the true God in their courts, as of old they had appealed to Woden. By a faulty, superficial reasoning, natural to an illiterate people, they appealed to the ordeal of "the waters of jealousy" in Numbers (v. 12-31), and to the intervention of God with reference to the sacrifice of Abel (Gen. iv. 4), the Deluge (Gen. vii.), the destruction of Sodom (Gen. xix.), the punishment of Core (Num. xvi.), and of Ananias (Acts v. 5). They did not realize that miracles were extraordinary things, dependent entirely upon God's will and not on man's; that God graciously answered our prayers, but He was not bound to render a decision at our bidding. Ordeals were, therefore, rightly characterized by Popes Nicholas I (858-867) and Honorius III (1216-1227) as a sinful, superstitious "tempting of God" (Isa. vii. 12).

Pope Stephen V (885-891), in a letter to the Archbishop of Mainz, forbids the ordeals of hot iron and of boiling water, declaring: "It is our duty to judge of crimes that are known either by the confession of the culprit or by the testimony of witnesses. What remains completely hidden, must be left to the judgment of Him, who alone reads the heart." Alexander II (1061-1073) tells us that "ordeals are not sanctioned by the canons of the Church"; Alexander III (1159-1181) denounces them as "detestable (*execrabile judicium*); Celestine III (1191-1198) is outspoken in his condemnation of the ordeal by duel; Honorius III (1216-1227) condemns absolutely all ordeals as "superstitious judgments against God's law and the Church's canons." This decree became the formal and authentic teaching of the Church from the thirteenth century, and is recorded in Raymond of Pennafort's collection of the Decretals (*Cf. Council of Lateran* in 1215).

The ordeal by mortal combat has been denounced by the Church from the earliest times. St. Avitus of Vienne (518) protested against it in the sixth century; St. Agobard (840) and the Council of Valence (855) in the ninth. It was declared "contrary to Christian peace, and destructive of body and soul"; the one killed was regarded as a suicide, and his opponent as an assassin. The modern duel for the satisfaction of one's honor is an absurd survival of the old pagan ordeal. Despite the severe measures enacted against duelling in France, Germany and Austria, the custom has been persistent to this day. Within twenty-five years the Prussian Minister of War, Von Einem, declared that the principle of the duel was still in force, and Chancellor von Bulow stated publicly that "the German army would not tolerate the presence of any officer, who was not ready to defend his honor by force of arms."

The Catholic Church forbade "the detestable custom of duelling" at the Council of Trent (Sess. xxiv., *De Ref.*, ch. xix.), and

Popes Benedict XIV (1752) and Leo XIII (1893) declared that nothing could ever justify it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Alzog, *The History of the Church*, i., 155; Dasu, *History of German Ordeals;* Lingard, *The Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, ii., 118; Mann, *Lives of the Popes*, ii. iii.; Vacandard, *Etudes de Critique et d'Histoire*, 191, 215.

THE SECOND COMMANDMENT

(Oaths)

Did not Christ (Matt. v. 33-37) and St. James forbid the taking of oaths in any form?

No, the literal interpretation of Christ's words held by the medieval Cathari and the modern Quakers is contrary to the Church's divine tradition and practice from the beginning. In counseling His followers "not to swear at all," Christ desired them to be so truthful and sincere that all oaths confirming their words would be unnecessary. Our Lord Himself replied to the solemn adjuration of the High Priest at His trial (Matt. xxvi. 63). St. Paul often "called God witness to what he said" (Rom. i. 9; 2 Cor. i. 25; xi. 31; Phil. i. 8; Gal. i. 20), and declared that "an oath for confirmation is the end of all controversy" (Heb. vi. 16).

St. Jerome, citing Jeremias (iv. 2), asserts that three conditions are required for a lawful oath; it must be truthful, stating things as they are, and honestly intending to keep the promise made; it must relate to a matter of some importance for the welfare of either soul or body, whether it be public or private; it must not go counter to the moral law.

Perjury of its very nature is always a grievous sin, for it is contrary to a divine precept (Lev. xix. 12), and implies a contempt of God (St. Thomas, *Summa*, IIa. IIæ., Q. 98, art. 3). The State (Kenny-Webb, *Outlines of Criminal Law*, 280) and Church (Canons 1743, 1757, 2323) both punish it severely, because it undermines public trust and confidence. The medieval Cathari, who declared it sinful to take an oath, were naturally regarded as enemies of the State as well as of the Church, for the feudal society rested entirely upon the oath of fealty (Vacandard, *The Inquisition*, 56).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Augustine, *Commentary on Canon Law* viii., 368; Koch, *Handbook of Moral Theology*, iv, 242-268; Slater, *Moral Theology*, i., 157.

THE SPURIOUS K. OF C. OATH

Do not the Knights of Columbus take an oath in their Fourth Degree, in which they swear to extirpate all heretics and heresies, declaring at the same time that the Pope has the power to depose all heretical rulers? Is not this oath to be found in the *Congressional Record?*

No, this oath is a malicious invention, the falsity of which has been proved in many an open court, here and in Canada. A history of the various prosecutions for criminal libel in printing and publishing this alleged oath may be found in a pamphlet, published by the Supreme Board of Directors of the Knights of Columbus at New Haven, Connecticut. It is entitled *Knights of Columbus vs. Criminal Libel and Malicious Bigotry.*

In the *Congressional Record* of February 15, 1913 (3215 *et seq.*), appears a Report of the Committee on Elections No. 1, on the contested election case of Eugene C. Bonniwell against Thomas C. Butler. The contestant had alleged that the circulation of this bogus oath against him was libellous. After reciting this bogus oath, the committee says: "This committee cannot condemn too strongly the publication of the false and libellous article referred to in the paper of Mr. Bonniwell, and which was the spurious Knights of Columbus Oath, a copy of which is appended to the paper."

The real pledge—not oath—taken by the Knights of Columbus in their Fourth Degree runs as follows: "I swear to support the Constitution of the United States. I pledge myself, as a Catholic citizen and Knight of Columbus, to enlighten myself fully upon my duties as a citizen, and to conscientiously perform such duties entirely in the interest of my country, regardless of all personal consequences. I pledge myself to do all in my power to preserve the purity and integrity of the ballot, and to promote reverence and respect for law and order. I promise to practise my religion openly and consistently, but without ostentation, and so to conduct myself in public affairs and in the exercise of public virtue, as to reflect nothing but credit upon our Holy Church, to the end that she may flourish, and our country prosper to the greater honor and glory of God."

THE THIRD COMMANDMENT

(Sunday Observance)

Why and when was the Sabbath changed from Saturday to Sunday? Who gave the Pope the right to

change the Sabbath (Dan. vii. 25)? Why must Catholics go to Mass every Sunday under penalty of Hell?

Why do Catholics break the Sabbath so easily by playing golf and baseball on Sunday? Do such people keep the Sabbath holy? Do Catholics believe that if they go to Mass, they can do as they like the rest of the day?

The Third Commandment of the Old Law: "Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath day" (Exod. xx. 8) was partly moral, the natural law obliging all men to devote some time exclusively to the worship of God, and partly ceremonial in as much as it determined the time and the details of its observance.

It is true that the Church could not abrogate the natural law, but the Apostles, as the divine infallible teachers of Christ's Church, could and did change the time, the motive and the details of the Sunday observance. They substituted the first day of the week, Sunday, for the seventh, Saturday; they made it commemorate the Resurrection of Christ instead of the Creation of the world (Exod. xx. 11); they mitigated in great measure the severity of the Jewish law, abolishing, for example, the death penalty (Exod. xxxi. 15) and certain prohibitions (Exod. xxxv. 3).

"The observance of the Sunday was at first supplemental to that of the Sabbath, but in proportion as the gulf between the Church and the Synagogue widened, the Sabbath became less and less important, and ended at length in being entirely neglected" (Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, 47). We find the first day of the week called *The Lord's Day* by St. Paul (Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2) and St. John (Apoc. i. 10), and *Sunday* by St. Justin Martyr (165) in his First Apology (65). That it commemorated Christ's Resurrection is mentioned by St. Ignatius (107; *Ad Magnes.*, ix.) and the *Epistle* of Barnabas (96, ch. xv.).

The Catholic Church requires her children to keep the Sunday holy by hearing Mass, and by resting from servile work.

The attendance at Sunday Mass is mentioned by St. Paul (Acts xx. 7) and by *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (100) xiv.: "On the Lord's Day come together and break bread. Offer the Eucharist after confessing your sins, that your sacrifice may be pure." St. Justin Martyr (165) describes in detail the Sunday Mass with its prayers, preaching, and the reading of the Old and New Testament (*Apol.*, 65).

The Church commands us to hear Mass under grievous sin, because she considers the deliberate refusal to attend public worship on Sunday an insult to Christ, who is really and objectively present upon our altars, and who as Priest and Victim

in the Sacrifice of the Mass, carries on the work of Calvary by appeasing the divine wrath, and obtaining mercy and forgiveness for us sinners.

Could you honestly claim to love your mother dearly, if, married and living near her, you failed to visit her at least once a week? The living Christ of the Eucharist is our next-door neighbor, who loves us with an infinite love, and requires us to love Him above all things. Even if there were no obligatory law, Catholics would deem it the greatest privilege to visit Christ once a week, and thereby share in His infinite Sacrifice. The great fervor of the early Christians made an obligatory law unnecessary. It was not until the year 300 that we come across a decree of the Council of Elvira (xxi.): "If anyone remains three Sundays in a city without going to Church, he shall be deprived of Communion for a time."

The obligation of hearing Mass ceases for weighty reasons. The Church excuses the sick and convalescent, those caring for the sick, soldiers or servants on duty, mothers who cannot leave their children, people who live miles from church, etc.

The abstention from servile work is first mentioned by Tertullian (160-240), who speaks of "deferring even our business on the Lord's Day, lest we give place to the devil" (*De Orat.*, xxiii.). This Sunday rest corresponds to a real need of human nature, as we see from its persistence down the ages, and from the vain attempt of the French Revolution to substitute the tenth for the seventh day.

The Church forbids servile work, *i. e.*, the rougher kind of manual labor performed to-day by ordinary workmen and of old by slaves. The object of the law is to enable all men, especially the poor, to hear Mass and to approach the Sacraments. The Church has never forbidden us innocent amusements on Sunday, provided we first attend Mass. The ultra-Sabbatarianism which forbids Sunday golf or baseball rests on a human tradition, born of Geneva in Calvin's time, and perpetuated in this country by the Puritans. The reaction against these man-made blue laws and "traditions of men" has made New England to-day in great part Unitarian (Richards, *A Loyal Life.*)

Bibliography: Villien, *History of the Commandments of the Church.* C. G. Aug., 1922.—D. L. iv. 858-894.—D. T. iv. 1308-1347.

THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT

(The Social Question)

Is not the social question merely an economic question, with which the Church has nothing to do?

No, it is not a mere economic question. Pope Leo XIII declared in his Encyclical on *Christian Democracy:* "The social question is above all a moral and religious matter, and for that reason must be settled by the principles of morality and according to the dictates of religion."

The Catholic Church alike condemns those who maintain that the solution of economic problems is her sole concern (Rev. R. J. Campbell, *Christianity and the Social Order*), and those who hold that the after-life is her sole province (James C. Morrison, *The Service of Man*).

It is perfectly true that Christ while on earth did not denounce the social evils of his day like slavery, nor play the part of a politician or social reformer, but He taught the principles of justice and charity, which, if followed out, would work the social reformation of the world. His divine mission was preeminently a spiritual one, He ever insisted on the supreme value of the individual soul (Matt. xvi. 26), the primary duty of loving God and one's neighbor (Matt. xii. 30, 31), the living of the divine life of grace, which He won for us by His Death upon the Cross. But He knew that the ultimate solution of the social question depended upon the universal recognition of the moral and religious teaching which He gave the world.

The Church, like her Divine Founder, has likewise a mission preeminently spiritual,—to bring salvation to all men through the grace of Christ. She holds herself aloof from all particular forms of government or parties, and from all special theories of economic and social reform. On principle alone, she is opposed both to a Socialism which identifies itself with materialistic aims and methods, and decrees the abolition of private property, and to a heartless Individualism, which unduly exalts private interests, while ignoring the claims of social justice and charity.

Bibliography: Day, *Christian Democracy;* Devas, *The Key to the World's Progress,* v.; Kerr, *Catechism of Catholic Social Principles;* Leo XIII, *Great Encyclical Letters.* C. B. Jan., Feb., 1911.—R. C. ii. 385; x. 544; xxi. 536.

THE LIVING WAGE

What is the Catholic theory of "a living wage"? Are not employers and workmen free to agree on whatever wages they like? Is not a free contract a just contract?

Pope Leo XIII in his Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum,* May 15, 1891, answered this question. He first points out the fallacious reasoning of those who maintain that injustice occurs only when

an employer refuses to pay the whole of the wages promised, and the workman does not complete the work agreed upon. If labor, he argues, were merely *personal,* a workman might accept any wages whatever, but it is also *necessary,* for, without the results of labor, a man cannot live (Gen. iii. 19). A free contract, therefore, if brought about by economic force, is utterly unfair, like a hold-up under threat of death, which deprives us of our money by physical force. He says: "While as a rule, employer and workman may agree freely as to wages; nevertheless, there underlies a dictate of natural justice more imperious and more ancient than any bargain between man and man, *viz* , that remuneration ought to be sufficient to support the wage earner in reasonable and frugal comfort. If through necessity, or fear of a worse evil, the workman accepts harder conditions, because an employer or contractor will afford him no better, he is made the victim of force and injustice."

As the average worker is a married man, a living wage should be sufficient to enable him to provide for his wife and children, and lay aside some money for a rainy day. The Scriptures call the defrauding a man of his wages "a sin that cries to heaven for vengeance" (James v. 4). The evil social results of inadequate wages are discussed in Webb's *Industrial Democracy,* ii.

Bibliography: Ryan, *The Living Wage; Distributive Justice;* Watt, *Capitalism and Morality,* v. A. Q. 1886, 322; 1899, 172.—C. W. ciii. 623; cxv. 453.—I. T. April, Oct., 1907; Jan., April, 1908.

STRIKES

Is it lawful for workmen to strike? Does your Church condemn the Sympathetic or the General Strike?

A strike is an organized cessation of work on the part of a number of workmen to compel the assent of an employer to certain definite demands. Whether an arbitrary severance of the relations between an employer and an employee is unjust (Ryan, *The Church and Socialism,* 116) or not (Cronin, *The Science of Ethics,* ii., 357), men are by nature free to give or withhold their labor, whether singly or in groups. They are morally justified to strike for a just and proportionate cause, provided they do not use physical violence against the non-strikers or the strike breakers. Among the just causes of a strike may be mentioned low wages, excessive hours, unsanitary conditions, the recognition of a union and the like. Men may rightly strike not only for a minimum just wage, but also for a wage above this level. In every strike the cause should be proportional to the

gravity of its effects (McLean, *The Morality of the Strike*, 77). A strike is an industrial war, and like the wars of nations should never be undertaken unless there is a well-grounded hope of a successful issue, the good results outweighing the positive harm done to employer and workman alike.

The natural right to strike is suspended, if the workmen have made a free and just contract with their employers. "Religion and the general good of society demand that such contracts be kept inviolate" (Leo XIII, *Rerum Novarum*). But often these contracts cease to bind, either because the employer has not fulfilled his part of the agreement, or because the contract itself contained some unjust, invalidating clauses.

The General Strike, which aims directly at the overthrow of the capitalist system, is immoral in its end and in its means. The workmen have no right whatever to exclude private owners from industry, nor to attempt to render their employer's property useless.

The limited Sympathetic Strike, in which men cease to work in a certain industry because some of their comrades are being unjustly treated, is not in itself unlawful. But the General Sympathetic Strike, which calls for the cooperation of all workers not to handle "the tainted goods" or of a certain industry, is hard to justify. For it frequently means the breaking of just contracts, calls upon the workers and the general public to suffer unreasonable hardships by spreading the strike, and it usually refuses even to consider the justice or injustice of the case. The workmen strike simply because their comrades are on strike—an essentially wrong principle.

Bibliography: Cronin, *The Science of Ethics*, ii., 364-371; McLean, *The Morality of the Strike*, iii., 125; Watt, *Captalism and Morality*, vii. C. G. Dec., 1924.—C. W. lix. 847.—I. T. Jan., 1912.—M. March, 1926.

COMMUNISM IN THE EARLY CHURCH

Were not Christ and the early Christians in Jerusalem communists? Did not the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries deny the right of private property; *v. g.*, John Chrysostom, Basil, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome?

No, they were not, although Socialists have often made this assertion (Bebel, *Die Frau*).

Christ never condemned private ownership as unjust. While insisting upon the dangers of riches (Matt. xix. 24), and picturing in a parable the heartless rich man in hell (Luke xvi. 22), He admits the possibility of the rich man, who is faithful to

God's law, attaining the Kingdom of Heaven (Matt. xix. 26). If Christ had regarded private ownership unlawful He would not have counseled the rich young man to *sell* what he possessed (Matt. xix. 21), nor would He have been content with Zacheus giving only *one-half* of his goods to the poor (Luke xix. 8). Instead of condemning private property, our Lord insists upon its proper distribution in works of mercy, as one of the conditions of gaining the kingdom of heaven (Matt. xxv. 35, 36).

The communism of the Jerusalem Christians (Acts ii. 44, 45) was similar to the common life of our religious communities, but it in no way implied a denial of private ownership. It was a purely voluntary agreement, as we learn from St. Peter's words to Ananias, "Whilst it remained, did it not remain to thee? And after it was sold, was it not in thy power"? (Acts v. 4.)

Dr. John A. Ryan has ably refuted the charge of socialism or communism brought against the early Fathers. He proves conclusively that not one of them denied either explicitly or implicitly the right of private property. While they denounced many of the rich men of their day for having acquired their wealth unjustly, and insisted upon a Christian devoting his superfluous goods to the poor, they themselves retained personal ownership of part of their estates (St. Basil, St. Ambrose), and taught with St. Jerome that "wealth is not an obstacle to the rich man, if he uses it well" (*Alleged Socialism of the Church Fathers*).

Bibliography: C. B. May, 1911.

POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY

Did not modern democracy originate with the Reformation, which did away forever with the medieval idea of the divine right of Kings?

No, the Reformation both in England and on the continent based the authority of the Tudor Kings and the German Princes upon divine right, the better to combat the divine authority of the Pope (Lord Acton, *The History of Freedom;* Figgis, *Gerson to Grotius*). Gierke states positively: "Political authority and absolute power by divine right was wholly foreign to the Middle Ages" (*Political Theories of the Middle Ages,* 38).

Blessed Cardinal Bellarmine (1542-1621), the great Jesuit theologian and apologist of the sixteenth century, defended popular sovereignty against the divine right theory of the absolutist James I of England. The natural or divine law, he maintained, which created political power in general (Prov. viii. 15, 16; Dan. iv. 22; ii. 37; Rom. xiii. 1, 2), vests it directly, not in any individual or king, but in the multitude or people, con-

sidered as a political unit. The right to rule is not bound up with any special mode of government (Leo XIII, *Immortale Dei*), but is determined by the consent of the people, or by the law of nations. "It depends upon the consent of the multitude to place over themselves a king, consul or other magistrate; and if there be a legitimate reason, the multitude can change the government into an aristocracy or a democracy." He ends by quoting St. Thomas: "Human dominions and princedoms are by human, not by divine right" (IIa. IIæ., Q. 10, art. 10; Q. 12, art. 2).

Another eminent Jesuit theologian of the period, Suarez (1548-1617), taught likewise that authority comes to the ruler only through the people, and denounced the divine right theory of James I as a teaching "new and singular, invented to exaggerate the temporal and to minimize the spiritual power."

Mr. Gaillard Hunt of the Congressional Library (*Catholic Historical Review*, October, 1917) declares that probably the immediate source of that part of the Virginia Declaration of Rights and the Declaration of Independence, which proclaims the equality of man and sovereignty by consent of the people, is to be found in the political theories of Cardinal Bellarmine. The same view is voiced by O'Rahilly, an Irish writer on political science, who says: "The Declaration of Independence is an accurate transcript of the Catholic mind. . . . There is strong historical evidence, that it is to the great Jesuit antagonists of James I, Bellarmine and Suarez, that England and America primarily owe the conception of democratic government. There is not a single English democratic writer between the Reformation and Suarez. The seventeenth century witnessed a reaction against the Protestant theory and practice of despotism by divine right, and a return, partial at least, to the medieval idea of natural rights, popular sovereignty, and the liberties of municipal and corporate bodies. The twentieth century is manifesting a further readoption of those political ideas" (*S.*, March, 1918; March, 1919).

Bibliography: Bellarmine, *De Laïcis*, iii., 6; Brodrick, *Blessed Robert Bellarmine;* Conway, *Can a Catholic Be President?;* Rager, *Democracy and Bellarmine;* Ryan, *The Right of Self-Government;* Suarez, *Defensio Fidei Catholicæ*, iii., 2, 5. S. Jan., April, 1921.

Was not Cardinal Bellarmine's theory of popular sovereignty responsible for the French Revolution as much as Rousseau's theory of the social contract? Is rebellion ever lawful?

No, the French Revolution was inspired by the political idea of Rousseau, and more directly by the tyranny, extrava-

gance, and absolutism of Louis XIV and Louis XV. There is a fundamental difference between the doctrines of Bellarmine and Rousseau. Bellarmine held that political power is a natural and a divine institution, necessary for the good of society, while Rousseau held it was a mere human convenience, existing solely by the agreement of men. Bellarmine derived political power immediately from the people as a whole, but ultimately from God, while Rousseau rested it solely on the contract between ruler and subject. Bellarmine held that men were bound in conscience to obey all lawful authority, while Rousseau declared "each one is united to all, but obeys only himself, and remains as free as before." While, therefore, Rousseau made the French Revolution possible, Bellarmine made the democracy of the United States a reality.

Catholic moralists, unlike the divine right theorists, declare that rebellion is lawful, when the people are oppressed by a lasting and intolerable tyranny; when legal and pacific means of reform have proved useless; when the revolt has a reasonable chance of success, and when it is approved by the larger and better portion of the people.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: D. April, 1865.

PRIVATE PROPERTY

Does not the Catholic Church in defending the right of property take the side of the rich against the poor? Why is the Catholic Church opposed to Socialism? Is it not the most hopeful remedy for the evils of our modern industrial system?

The Catholic Church condemns Socialism, not because she has any special brief for the rich, but because she upholds the moral right of private property, which Socialism denies. Pope Leo XIII in his Encyclicals, *Apostolici Muneris* (1878) and *Rerum Novarum* (1891), declared that "the proposals of Socialism are emphatically unjust, because, by destroying private property, they would rob the lawful possessor, bring the State into a sphere that is not its own, and cause complete confusion in the community."

Catholic moralists have always admitted the evils of the modern capitalism; its avarice and greed, its contempt for justice, its enslavement of the poor, its control of governments, its excessive love of gambling and speculation, its shirking of

personal responsibility, its manipulation of the press and the like. But while fully admitting these evils, they hold that they are less than the evils attendant upon Socialism. For Socialism is a quack cure, worse than the disease, just as suicide is the unbeliever's cure for an unhappy life, and divorce the cure of a libertine's unhappy marriage.

Catholic moralists again teach that the right of property in material things is a moral right, founded in human nature. It belongs not merely to the community at large, but to private corporations, families and individuals. Every man has the right, not only to a general use of nature's bounty, but to the possession of goods as his own. This right extends, not only over objects *consumed in use* such as food, shelter, and clothing, but also over objects *consumed in production,* such as land, mines, railroads, factories, stores, banks, etc.

The control of public utilities such as telegraphs, railroads and subways by States or municipalities is not Socialism, nor would the State ownership of any particular industry such as coal-mining be Socialistic, if such control were demanded by the public good. It would, however, be manifestly unjust for the State to take over the mines or the railroads without giving due compensation to their private owners.

On the other hand the Church has always insisted upon the limitations of the right of private ownership, a principle too often ignored by the post-Reformation economists, who held that a man could do what he pleased with his own property. The private owner is a steward of his property according to Catholic teaching, and must so use it that other men may enjoy its benefits on certain just conditions. As St. John Chrysostom put it in the fourth century: "Are not the earth and the fullness thereof the Lord's? If, therefore, our possessions are the common gift of the Lord, they belong also to our fellows." The right use of property must provide the worker with a living wage, and enable the consumer to buy what he needs at a just price. If injustice is being done, the State has a right to interfere to enforce the just limitations of private ownership. Pope Leo XIII says: "Whenever the general interest or any particular class suffers or is threatened with injury, which can in no other way be met or prevented, it is the duty of the public authority to intervene" (*Rerum Novarum*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Belloc, *The Servile State; The Principle of Private Property;* Elder, *A Study in Socialism;* Goldstein, *Socialism;* Harrington, *Socialism, Capitalism and Communism;* Kelleher, *Private Ownership;* Ryan, *The Church and Socialism; The Christian Doctrine of Property.* A. Q. 1878, 1.—C. W. xc. 493; xciii. 30; lxxxv. 145, 500; lxv. 721; cv. 14.

THE FIFTH COMMANDMENT

(Suicide)

Is suicide ever lawful, namely, to save one's honor? Did not some of the saints commit suicide? Are not all who commit suicide insane? And if so, is not your Church most cruel in denying them Christian burial, thus sentencing them to Hell? Is not suicide at times a courageous act?

Suicide is the intentional causing of one's own death, either directly by taking poison, or indirectly by exposing oneself to certain death without just cause. It is not true that all men who commit suicide are insane (Gaupp, *Uber den Selbstmord*), although many undoubtedly are (O'Malley-Walsh, *Essays in Pastoral Medicine,* 306). The pagan Stoics held that suicide was a lawful act of courage (Baumgartner, *Seneca und das Christenthum*), but the Church has always stigmatized it as an act of cowardice against the Fifth Commandment: "Thou shalt not kill" (Exod. xx. 13), due as a rule to a life of thievery and debauchery.

Suicide is never lawful, for it is contrary to the natural law, which requires us to preserve life as God's greatest gift to men, and the divine law, which declares that God alone "has power of life and death" (Wisd. xvi. 13). He alone can say when it must begin and when it must end. It is, moreover, a sin against society—a son, a father, a husband, a citizen, cowardly shirking the duties he owes his brethren. The Christian Gospel commands us to suffer trials and sorrows in imitation of Christ's sufferings, in order to gain the kingdom of heaven (2 Cor. iv. 17).

The fact that some of the martyrs did not wait for their executioners to put them to death, but voluntarily leaped into the fire and died in the flames, like St. Apollonia of Alexandria in 249, can only be explained by a clearly manifested inspiration of God. The Church refuses Christian burial to "those who deliberately kill themselves" (Canon 1240) "from despair or in wrath" (*Decree of the Holy Office,* May 16, 1866), but she does not thereby pass judgment on their eternal lot. That belongs to God alone.

Bibliography: Cronin, *The Science of Ethics,* ii., 52-59; Feeney, *The Suicide Problem in the United States;* Koch, *Handbook of Moral Theology,* iii., 74-83; O'Malley, *The Ethics of Medical Homicide,* 244, 260. A. Q. 1880, 539.—C. E. xiv. 326.—C. W. xxxiv. 577; xlviii. 183.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Is not capital punishment murder? Why punish crime by committing another crime?

The Catholic Church has always taught that the State has the right to inflict death for grievous crime, and thereby to preserve public order and security. St. Thomas expressly states that "such killing is not murder" (IIa. IIæ., Q. 100, art. 8, ad. 3). Pope Innocent III declared against the Waldensians that "the secular power could inflict the death penalty without grievous sin" (Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, No. 425). *The Catechism of the Council of Trent* says: "The magistrates who condemn to death . . . are not only not guilty of murder, but eminently obey this law (*i. e.*, the Fifth Commandment) which prohibits murder" (Part III., ch. 6, Q. 4).

The Old Testament prescribed the death penalty for certain crimes (Gen. ix. 6; Exod. xxi. 12, 14, 23; Lev. xx. 2; xxiv. 17; Deut. xvii. 6; xix. 12). The New Testament takes it for granted that the State has the right to put criminals to death (John xix. 10, 11; Acts xxv. 11), because it is "God's minister, an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil" (Rom. xiii. 4). While clearly asserting the right of capital punishment, the Church has never demanded its infliction as the only possible deterrent of crime, however heinous. That she leaves to the judgment of the individual citizens. Her Bishops have often called upon the State to be merciful to criminals, and her canon law inflicts irregularity upon all clerics who cooperate in the administration of the death penalty (Canon 984).

The one convincing argument for capital punishment is the State's right of self-defense. Just as the individual has the right to defend his life against the attacks of an unjust aggressor, so the State has the right to defend itself against external (war) and internal enemies (capital punishment), who by their crimes undermine the very foundations of the social order. "The slaying of an evildoer is lawful," says St. Thomas, "inasmuch as it is directed to the welfare of the whole community" (IIa. IIæ. Q. 64, art. 3).

Many to-day deny the right of capital punishment, because they deny the freedom of the will, and consider crime as a disease due to heredity or environment. They would segregate the criminal indeed as one segregates the man afflicted with smallpox in a pest-house, but they deem imprisonment ample punishment even for the most heinous murder.

Others will tell you that life imprisonment is more severe and more effective a punishment than the death penalty. We do not think this true with regard to the vast majority of criminals.

There is no escaping death, which is the most striking of terrors, but "the lifer" can always look forward hopefully to a possible escape or a possible pardon. I was in St. Louis when the infamous murderer, Cole Younger, was welcomed home by thousands after having been freed from his "life" imprisonment in a Minnesota penitentiary! Logically, if one admits that the State has the right to inflict a severer punishment than death, one must likewise admit that it has the right to inflict death itself.

A few countries of Europe—Belgium, Holland, Italy, Portugal and Roumania, and some cantons of Switzerland—together with a few of our States—Rhode Island, Maine, Michigan, Wisconsin and Iowa—have abolished capital punishment. Whether this policy has bettered conditions is an open question. It certainly in no way dispensed with the State's power to inflict the death penalty; it simply implied that certain countries temporarily suspended the exercise of their right. It is certainly more in harmony with the Gospel to limit the death penalty to certain grave crimes like murder, piracy or treason. Blackstone in his *Commentaries* rightly condemned the English laws of the eighteenth century which made one hundred and sixty offenses liable to capital punishment (Book VI., ch. 1).

Bibliography: Rickaby, *Moral Philosophy,* 343-350.

VIVISECTION

Is not vivisection immoral, involving as it does great cruelty to animals? Have we no duties towards them?

No, vivisection is licit and moral, for animals were created for the service of man (Gen. ix. 3; Deut. iv. 19; Ps. viii. 8), and therefore "man without injustice uses them, either by killing them, or in any other way" (*Contra Gentiles,* Lib. iii., ch. 112, n. 7). To talk about their rights and our duties towards them is nonsense. Cardinal Newman well says: "You know we have no duties towards the brute creation; there is no relation of justice between them and us. Of course, we are bound not to treat them ill, for cruelty is an offence against that holy law which our Maker has written on our hearts, and it is displeasing to Him. But they can claim nothing at our hand; into our hands they are absolutely delivered. We may use them, we may destroy them at our pleasure, not our wanton pleasure, but still for our own ends, for our own benefit and satisfaction, provided that we can give a rational account of what we do" (*Omnipotence in Bonds*).

There is no branch of medical science that has not been bene-

fited by vivisection. It has led to many important discoveries like Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood; it has taught us the effects of many a poison and drug; it has advanced surgery by testing new methods of sewing up wounds; it has saved many human lives by its experiments in serum treatments, especially in hydrophobia. The true scientist never inflicts more pain than is necessary, and, wherever possible, he anæsthetizes the animals on which he experiments.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Heidenhain, *Die Vivesektion.* C. E. xv. 494.—D. July, 1894.

EUGENICS

Why is the Catholic Church opposed to the modern science of Eugenics? Does she object to the betterment of the race? Ought not the State prohibit the mentally defective from marrying? Has a man a right to beget childen, who will be physically unfit, and a burden upon the community?

The Catholic Church yields to no one in her zeal for the betterment of the race, which she has always furthered by her moral and her spiritual teaching. But she uncompromisingly sets her face against all the materialistic social experiments of the modern eugenists which outrage human dignity, go counter to elemental ethics, encourage sexual immorality inside and outside of marriage, and lead to a callous disregard of the weak members of the community. She condemns as absolutely immoral birth control, indiscriminate sterilization of the unfit and the mentally defective, the euthanasia of incurables and the like. The end does not justify the means. We cannot do evil that good may come (Rom. iii. 8).

The Church separates the chaff from the wheat in the matter of Eugenics, condemning what is evil in the movement, and commending what is good. As Father Slater says: "The physical and mental good of the race of mankind is part of the object of charity. If the spiritual good of mankind be added to the list of objects, the end of Eugenics would be identical with that for which the Catholic Church exists and works. . . . Theology teaches that charity is well ordered. . . . While then, theology is quite at one with Eugenics as to the end to be aimed at, it very cautiously scrutinizes the means proposed for the attainment of that end" (*Questions of Moral Theology*, 259).

The Catholic Church, while divinely founded to educate man for the kingdom of God, has never neglected to foster his physical well-being. She has always combated the body's two greatest scourges, alcoholism and venereal disease, by her teaching

on temperance and chastity. By demanding absolute continence in the unmarried, both men and women, she provides for the spread of a pure race, and by her divine law of conjugal chastity she fights the chief foes of marriage—adultery, birth control and divorce.

"Moral theology," writes Dr. Bruehl, "knows nothing of an absolute right to marry. No one has the right to give existence to beings whom he cannot properly support, and who inevitably will become a burden upon the community. The right to marry is dependent upon fitness for the married life, and ability to fulfill the duties of the married state. Where the prospects are that an individual cannot live up to these duties, reason and charity counsel, if they do not dictate, abstention. Due consideration for posterity demands that those who can bring into the world only diseased and defective progeny, should forego their right to marry. If moral theology hesitates to bar them absolutely, it is because such a proposition imposes great hardship, and presupposes a degree of heroism that cannot be expected of the average man and woman" (*H.*, February 1, 1927).

It certainly would not be unjust to prevent mental defectives of the lowest grade from marrying, as they can have no adequate concept of the nature of marriage, and would only prove a burden to themselves and to the State. On the other hand it would be unjust to prevent the higher-grade defectives from marrying, for with proper training, either in special institutions or in the special classes of our schools, they can be and actually have been educated to accept and live up to all the responsibilities of the normal citizen.

All legislation on this matter we think ill-advised, because such intimate matters cannot safely be left to the regulation of public officials, often devoid of both religion and common sense. Such laws in a short time become a laughing stock, like our present prohibition law, from which the unthinking zealots expected so much. They are evaded by fraud and bribery, and bring in their train worse evils.

Bibliography: Bruehl, *Birth Control and Eugenics;* Fallon, *Eugenics;* Gerrard, *The Church and Eugenics.* A. Q. 1895, 289, 721.—C. B. April, 1900.—C. W. cv. 209.—E. Oct., 1911.

THE STERILIZATION OF THE CRIMINAL AND THE FEEBLE-MINDED

Does the Catholic Church condemn the sterilization of the unfit, the mentally defective and the criminal?

Sterilization consists in a surgical operation, which renders a man (vasectomy) or a woman (salpingetomy) incapable of

having children. In many of our States—Oregon, Indiana, Wisconsin, Connecticut, Virginia, etc.—it may be ordered by a tribunal acting on the expert testimony of a commission of doctors, connected with some prison or some State institution for the insane or the mentally deficient.

The Catholic Church teaches that God alone has the supreme dominion over life, as man's Creator and Lord. Neither the individual nor the State possesses such absolute power. The individual may not wantonly take his own life, nor may the State arbitrarily take the lives of its citizens. The individual also has the right to his bodily integrity, and mutilation may not be inflicted upon him save for an urgent and just cause.

The surgical removal of a diseased organ, *i. e.,* ovariotomy, even though it results in impotence or sterility, is undoubtedly lawful, although many surgeons perform this operation without sufficient reason to follow out a questionable therapeutic theory, or merely to satisfy the wishes of a patient. Vasectomy is also lawful, when there is danger of death or idiocy.

Sterilization as a punishment for crime, although not in keeping with modern humanitarian ideas, is within the province of the State (Slater, *Questions of Moral Theology,* 265). The legal penalty for rape in medieval Catholic England was far more drastic (Bracton, *De Legibus Angliæ,* iii., 2, 28). But most theologians deem it "wrong, because as a punishment it is neither effective, nor necessary, nor reformatory, nor exemplary, nor reparative—it lacks every quality of a justifiable punishment. . . . It is not a punishment to the men upon whom it is done, but it is an unnecessary deprivation of an essential right of these men,—an excessive, ill-ordered attack on a primary right of man, and an act of violence against human nature and its Author, without adequate reason" (O'Malley, *The Ethics of Medical Homicide,* 264, 265).

Eugenical sterilization is a vital problem to-day in the United States, for laws permitting it have been passed in some fifteen States, and the United States Court, strangely enough, has lately declared a Virginia statute allowing it constitutional. It is purely preventive and prophylactic, its one purpose being to prevent the transmission of undesirable hereditary traits to posterity, by depriving the insane, the imbecile, the mentally defective, etc., of the faculty of procreation.

Catholic moralists advance many reasons for questioning the right of the State to pass such laws. In the first place Catholics ask—who are the unfit? They cannot accept the ideal of excellence, held by the unbelieving materialist, and expressed merely in mental and physical terms, which utterly ignores the moral and spiritual factors in the problem. They abhor the Nietzchean ideal of the Superman, knowing that the most disastrous as-

saults upon civilization have been made not by the weak, but by the strong. While the Gospel of Christ does not glorify disease, pauperism or feeble-mindedness, it regards the sick, the poor and the mentally defective as children of God, possessed of immortal souls, created for eternal blessedness, and entitled to the respect and reverence due to every human personality.

Again, while the fact of hereditary transmission of character cannot be doubted, the laws of such transmission are as yet shrouded in the greatest mystery. A State physician's mere guess work that a particular couple will give birth to defective and degenerate offspring is not a sufficient warrant for an operation of so serious a character. We do not convict criminals until they are proved guilty in open court. Are not the feeble-minded entitled to as much consideration?

Practically speaking, the inherent possibility of abuse, lurking in all sterilization laws, ought to be enough to erase them from our statute books. The wide classification given to the unfit (Laughlin, *Eugenical Sterilization*), and the wide powers given by some States to the State Eugenist make possible an arbitrary State Inquisition, more tyrannical and more uncontrolled than the Church Inquisition of the Middle Ages. The tyranny of the prohibition enforcement law with its continual disregard of the life and liberty guaranteed by our Constitution, is but a trifling matter compared with the tyranny of an enforced sterilization law. That is why it has become practically a dead letter everywhere.

Many reputable physicians maintain that the existence of a vast number of unsexed individuals in the State, would inevitably lead to the spread of immorality and venereal disease. Thus Dr. Hayes (*Introduction to the Study of Sociology*), Dr. Davenport (*Heredity in Relation to Eugenics*), and Drs. Queen and Mann (*Social Pathology*).

Finally, sterilization by State law is utterly inadequate to free society from the evil of feeble-mindedness and its attendant ills. Heredity at best is only one of the several sources of mental deficiency. It is wrong to place the emphasis on negative Eugenics, for as Dr. Todd says: "After all, will mere extinction of the known defectives touch the core of the problem? Not at all. Indeed, some critics hold that negative Eugenics is not Eugenics at all. The defectives who would thus be eugenically exiled, so to speak, constitute but a tiny fraction of society,—only one-half of one per cent" (*Theories of Social Progress*).

As a nation we are not so degenerate as to require such laws for our preservation. Other remedies are available, *viz.*, segregation, which are more consonant with human dignity, and less subject to serious abuse. Our ill-advised prohibition legislation should teach us that a law to be good, and according to reason,

must be enforceable in such a way, that the enforcement does not give rise to evils more serious than the abuses it aims to correct.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bruehl, *Birth Control and Eugenics;* Conway, *The Church and Eugenics;* Flick, *Eugenics;* O'Malley, *The Ethics of Medical Homicide.* E. xlii., xliii., xliv., xlvi., xlvii., xlviii.—E. G.
April, May, June, July, 1928.

THE MORALITY OF WAR

Does not the Bible in both the Old and the New Testament declare that all war is immoral? Did not God forbid David to erect the temple, because "thou hast been a man of war" (1 Chron. xxviii. 3)? Do not Isaias and Micheas declare that war would cease with the new dispensation (Isa. ii. 4; xi. 13; Mich. iv. 3)?

Does not Christ say: "That ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also" (Matt. v. 39)? Did not Christ rebuke Peter for using the sword (Matt. xxvi. 52)? Does not St. Paul teach: "Avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath" (Rom. xii. 19)? Did not the early Christian Fathers denounce the military profession?

The Bible never declares war intrinsically immoral. On the contrary, in hundreds of passages God approves (Exod. xvii. 11; Num. xxi. 3; Deut. vii. 1; Jud. iii. 1-4; 1 Kings xv. 2) and commands war (Jud. iv. 6, 7), and even works miracles to ensure victory for His chosen people (Gen. xiv. 19; Jos. x. 11-14; Jud. iv. 15; 2 Mach. x. 29). The God of armies (Isa. iii. 1; v. 7; Osee xii. 5; Amos v. 14) often sends war as a chastisement for men's sins (Lev. xxvi. 24; Deut. xxviii. 40; Jos. xvii. 13; Jer. v. 14).

Chronicles xviii. does not condemn war, but speaks of David's punishment for the murder of Urias (2 Kings xi. 17). Isaias and Micheas foretell the peace which the Redemption of Christ will bring mankind, or, as others hold, allude to the spiritual weapons which Christianity will use for the spread of the Gospel.

Our Lord's chief commandment was the love of God and the love of the neighbor for God's sake. If the world were faithful to it, war would become impossible. But a pagan nationalism often sets at naught the Christian principles of justice and of charity. In the New Testament, St. John the Baptist gives good advice to the soldiers of his day (Luke iii. 14), and our Lord

praises highly the faith of the Centurion (Matt. viii. 10), but neither asks the soldier to abandon his calling as immoral.

Christ's words in the Sermon on the Mount are a counsel of perfection addressed to the individual (Matt. v. 39), while St. Paul forbids private vengeance as a grievous sin. Christ rebuked St. Peter for an imprudent act of violence, an action utterly uncalled for, as our Lord could have had twelve legions of angels to help him had He wished (v. 53).

The early Fathers never condemned war as intrinsically immoral. They (Tertullian, Origen) often objected to Christians serving in the pagan armies, because of the danger of apostasy. At any moment the Christian soldier might receive a command, which required an act of public idolatry.

While recognizing that war is one of the greatest evils that can confront a nation, the Catholic Church has always held that a just war is licit and moral. She condemns the pacifism of the Quaker who declares all wars incompatible with Christianity, as well as the pagan view that modern aggressive wars are a nation's right and duty (Von Bernhardi, *L'Allemagne et la Prochaine Guerre;* Jones, *The Later Period of Quakerism*).

A nation goes to war in self-defense. For a war to be just, Catholic moralists insist upon the following conditions: A State can rightly declare war only when it is morally certain that its rights are being actually violated, or are in certain and imminent danger; when the cause of war is in proportion to the evils incident to the war; when every peaceful method of settlement has proved inadequate; when there is a well-grounded hope of bettering conditions by the conflict. If these conditions were fulfilled—they rarely have been in history—wars would rarely happen.

Pope Benedict XV in a letter to the warring nations, August, 1917, declared that three things were necessary to prevent war and to bring about a lasting peace: the substitution of moral right for material force; an international agreement for the reduction of armaments; compulsory arbitration of all international disputes.

The greatest obstacle to-day to the peace of the world lies in an exaggerated nationalism fostered by a jingo press, and the false assumption of modern pagan militarists, who hold that wars are inevitable. Everyone seems agreed that the next war, if it come, will utterly destroy our present civilization, both morally and materially. To prevent it, and ensure the peace of the world, "the love of peace," as our present Holy Father, Pius XI, said, "must be deeply rooted in our hearts." His first Encyclical at Christmas, 1922, was a Peace Letter to the world, and the watchword of his pontificate is, "The Peace of Christ in the Reign of Christ."

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Cronin, *The Science of Ethics*, ii., 663-679; Hayes, *Essays on Nationalism;* Keating, *Catholics and the Problems of Peace;* Moon, *Syllabus on International Relations;* Pégues, *St. Thomas et la Guerre;* Pissard (ed.), *La Guerre Sainte en Pays Chrétien;* Rickaby, *Moral Philosophy*, 191; Ryan, *Declining Liberty; International Ethics;* Stratmann, *The Church and War;* Vandepol, *La Doctrine Scolastique de Guerre.* C. C. April 3, 1915.—C. E. xv. 546-550.—D. T. vi. 1899-1962.—E. T. Oct. 5, Nov. 15, 1914.—M. June, 1910.—R. A. July 15, Aug. 1, 1906.

THE SIXTH COMMANDMENT

(Instruction in Sex Hygiene)

Does the Catholic Church approve of the teaching of sex hygiene in the schools? Does not St. Paul say: "Unto the pure all things are pure" (Eph. v. 31)?

No, her Bishops in Germany, France and the United States, and her moralists everywhere, have been most outspoken in their opposition to the teaching of sex hygiene in the schools. Detailed instruction in sexual matters is inadequate to furnish the sanctions and checks necessary to educate our children to purity, and it is morally harmful, because it increases the flame of sensuality it is supposed to quench. Mere knowledge of the consequences of sexual sin, imparted by teachers who are often devoid of morals and religion, cannot make a child virtuous; it tells him merely how to take precautions against disease.

Christian reticence, taught by St. Paul (Eph. v. 31), has been wisely observed in the Catholic Church from the beginning. The text cited: "Unto the pure all things are pure" is not to the point, for the Apostle was simply referring to the obsolete Jewish law regarding unclean animals.

The public discussion of sex details destroys modesty and shame, the two natural protectors of chastity, as Father Tierney styled them (*The Church and the Sex Problem*). The true place for such information and guidance is the home. common sense and a love for one's own, prompting the father when to speak to his boy, and the mother to her girl. Catholic parents are taught that the virtue of purity is built on obedience to conscience and the laws of God, publicly from the pulpit and privately in the confessional, where the priest as another Christ acts as spiritual father and physician.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Gatterer-Krus, *Educating to Purity;* Gillet, *Innocence and Ignorance; The Education of Character;* Hennrich, *Watchful Elders;* Melody, *The Catholic Educational Association Bulletin*, Feb., 1914. M. Aug., 1923.

THE SEVENTH COMMANDMENT

(Interest)

Have not the Bible, the early Fathers, and your Church generally until most recent times condemned the taking of interest as unjust and immoral? Why does she allow to-day what she condemned as a sin in the past? Did not your Church by prohibiting interest (Council of Vienne, 1311) "curse the material development of civilization" (Lecky, *The Rise and Influence of Rationalism in Europe,* ch. vi.)?

The Old Testament condemned the taking of interest, or usury as a mere economic regulation, suited to the circumstances of the time (Exod. xxii. 25; Lev. xxv. 35; Deut. xxiii. 19). This is clear from the fact that while the Old Law prohibited usury between Jew and Jew, it permitted it between Jew and Gentile (Deut. xxiii. 19).

The New Testament is absolutely silent on this question. It is true that some Catholic theologians have thought that Luke vi. 34, 35, referred to interest taking, but they were wrong. Our Lord is simply calling upon Christians to give to the poor with a willing heart, expecting nothing in return.

The early Fathers never put forward any philosophical theory on usury. They viewed the matter solely from a practical standpoint, and bitterly denounced the money-lenders of their day as cruel and heartless oppressors of the poor (Cleary, *The Church and Usury,* 37-62).

The medieval councils and theologians condemned the taking of interest, because money was then normally only a medium of exchange for articles of consumption, and a measure of their value. "To charge interest on money at that period," says Father Cronin, "demanding in return for money lent the original sum and something additional for its use by the borrower, would be attributing to money a double value it did not then possess" (*Ethics,* ii., 332). To-day the Church allows a just rate of interest on loans, because "money is not merely a medium of exchange, but an instrument of production; and just as money may be charged for the use of land, or of a house, so money may be charged for the use of money. Money now has its fair and reasonable price like any other commodity, and the sin of usury is committed not by taking a fair and reasonable interest for a loan, but by exacting excessive interest" (Slater, *Moral Theology,* i., 324).

Lecky's calumnious statement has been refuted by a number

of non-Catholic professors of economics; Marshall (*Principles of Economics,* i., ii., 8), Ashley (*Economic History and Theory,* Book II., ch. vi., 438), Nicholson (*Political Economy,* iii., 132). and Cunningham (*Growth of English Industry and Commerce,* 25). Ashley writes: "It is altogether misleading and unfair to speak of the prohibition (of interest) as putting obstacles in the way of the employment of capital. So far as wealth was intended to serve as capital, it found ways open for its employment—ways which were adequate for the time, and against which the canonists had not a word to say." Dr. Cunningham writes: "It is commonly supposed that narrow-minded ecclesiastics laid down an arbitrary and unjustifiable rule against taking interest, and that they thus hampered the growth of trade. The rule was not arbitrary, but commended itself to ordinary common sense, and it did not hamper trade. . . . No real hindrance was put in the way of material progress in the then existing state of society by these restrictions. . . . The merchants were not restrained from using the capital of other men in their ventures, or from remunerating them for the risk incurred."

The Church's legislation originated in her desire to protect the poor from the rapacity of the money-lender. The modern State simply takes a page out of her history, when it passes laws curbing the avarice of the usurer of to-day, and empowers the judges at their discretion to rescind the usurer's "hard and unconscionable bargains" (*English Money-lenders Act of 1900*).

Bibliography: Cleary, *The Church and Usury.* C. E. xv. 235.—R. C. xvi. 179.

THE EIGHTH COMMANDMENT

(Lying)

Is it not lawful to lie in some cases as Luther taught? Do we not all tell lies to children, to the sick, and to those who have no right to know the truth?

No, it is never lawful to lie under any circumstances, for a lie is intrinsically bad and unnatural. Father Cronin well defines a lie as: "Any speech, statement, communication or representation made to another person, which really purports to represent what one believes to be true, but which the speaker knows to be untrue" (*The Science of Ethics,* ii., 74).

St. Thomas teaches that every lie is a sin, slight or grievous according to circumstances, because "a lie, if of its nature evil, as bearing on undue matter. For as words are naturally the sign of thought, it is unnatural and undue to signify by words what one has not in his mind" (*Summa,* IIa. IIæ., Q. 110, art. 3).

Some moralists, aware that in most cases men lie only to deceive others, have included this intention of deceiving in their definition of a lie. They are wrong, because instances of lying occur in which there is no such intention. The desire to deceive belongs to "the perfection" of a lie (*Ibid.*, Q. 110, art. 1), but it is not a constituent of the lie itself.

Lying is condemned in both the Old Testament and the New. The Eighth Commandment orders: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor" (Exod. xx. 16; Deut. v. 20; Matt. xix. 18). The Old Testament says repeatedly that lying is hateful to the Lord (Prov. vi. 17; xii. 22; Ecclus. vii. 14; xx. 26-28), and merits divine chastisement (Ps. v. 7). Our Lord attributes lying to the devil, the father of lies (John viii. 44), and challenges the Jews to convict Him of any sin against the truth (John viii. 21, 46). St. Paul and St. James warn the early Christians against lying (Eph. iv. 25; Col. iii. 9; James iii. 14), and St. John declares that unrepentant liars will suffer the eternal torments of Hell (Apoc. xxi. 8; xxii. 16).

Luther has been severely condemned even by his own brethren for his immoral and un-Christian advice to the Landgrave, Philip of Hesse, urging him to deny publicly his double marriage, in order not to encourage polygamy among the common people. Luther believed it lawful to lie for the spread of his new teaching, and some of his lies are still passing current after four centuries. He once said: "What harm would it be if a man told a good lusty lie in a worthy cause; for the sake of the Christian Churches" (Grisar, *Luther,* i., 51). Luther also acted a lie when he ordered everything in the Canon of the Mass that suggested sacrifice to be eliminated, but retained the elevation with certain accompanying ceremonies the better to deceive the plain man (Janssen, *History of the German People,* iii., 64). Here are plain evidences of the Lutheran—not Jesuit—theory that a good end justifies a bad means.

We are not guilty of the sin of lying when we present to children information beyond their years in a childish dress suited to their mentality, or when we tell them beautiful legends of the saints or charming fairy tales about Santa Claus, or the Easter Bunnie.

Keeping a bit of news from a sick person, when we are confident that the shock of its telling might endanger his life, is permissible, as St. Augustine (*Contra Men.,* x.) and St. Thomas teach (*Summa,* IIa. IIæ., Q. 110, art. 3, ad. 4). But lying to the sick is a most grievous sin when it prevents the sick person from making his peace with God on a deathbed. I once attended an Italian who had been told by his physician and his kinsfolk that he would be up and about in a few weeks. He refused at first to go to confession, although he went at once when I told him

he would be dead before midnight. The well-meant but cruel lies of his friends might possibly have been the occasion of his eternal damnation.

"God's sanctity," writes Father Rickaby, "is in His being true to Himself. His veracity is part of His sanctity. He cannot in His speech, or revelation of Himself, contradict what He really has in His mind, without ceasing to be holy and being no longer God.

But the sanctity of intellectual creatures must be, like their every other attributes and perfection, modeled on the corresponding perfection of their Maker. Holiness must mean truthfulness in man, for it means truthfulness in God. God's words cannot be at variance with His thought, for God is essential holiness. Nor can man speak otherwise than as he thinks without marring the attribute of holiness in himself, that is, without doing wrong. And this is the real, intrinsic, primary and inseparable reason why lying is everywhere and always wrong" (*Political and Moral Essays,* 230).

Bibliography: Grisar, *Luther,* i., 335; ii., 15, 49, 385; iv., 28, 41, 80-178; v., 537; vi., 513; Koch, *Handbook of Moral Theology,* v., 52-72; Slater, *Manual of Moral Theology,* 290-293; Waffelaert, *Dissertation sur le Mensonge.* C. B. April, May, 1908.—C. E. xv. 469.—D. A. iv. 957-982.—R. C. xxiii. 530; xxiii. 666; xxiv. 158.

MENTAL RESERVATION

Is it not true that whereas you theoretically condemn lying, you allow it in practice by your teaching of equivocation and mental restriction?

No, this is not true. It is good for us at the outset to define our terms, so that as, St. Paul puts it, we may not "fight as one beating the air" (1 Cor. ix. 26).

Mental reservation is an act of the mind which restricts the natural meaning that the spoken words appear to bear. If I give no outward clue to my mental limitation of the spoken phrase, either in the peculiar wording I use, or in the circumstances of person and of place, I am using a pure mental reservation, or, in plain English, a lie. If I do indicate externally my mental limitation according to the usages of language and of social custom, I am using a broad mental reservation, which is always permissible and lawful.

Non-Catholics often confuse these totally different things, and translate the Latin term, *æquivocatio* (broad mental reservation),

by the English word equivocation (pure mental reservation, or lie). If our questioner keeps this distinction in mind, he will readily grasp the doctrine of Catholic moralists.

A few examples will illustrate our teaching. An importunate visitor, who has called repeatedly at my home, and borrowed money from me which he never dreamed of repaying, is told by my intelligent servant, "My master is not at home." Do not the usages of modern society make it clear that I am not at home TO HIM?

Cardinal Newman gives a good instance: "What news from France, my lord?" some one asked of a cabinet minister. "I do not know," he replied, "I have not read the papers." No private citizen has the right to expect a government official to disclose a government secret in the course of an ordinary conversation.

A murderer is arrested in the very act of deliberate murder. He is allowed by our courts to plead "not guilty," the legal theory and practice being that he is innocent until his guilt is juridically proved.

A priest may be asked in court—he has been asked—to divulge the divine secret of the confessional, and he answers rightly: "I do not know." He does not know with a communicable knowledge, and all the courts of the civilized world grant him the right to guard inviolate the sacred seal.

Our Lord gave us a striking instance of a mental reservation, when He declared that the Son of God did not know the Day of Judgment (Mark xiii. 32). He certainly did know it, as all the Fathers maintained in their controversies with the Arians, the Apollinarists, the Nestorians, the Monophysites, etc. (Lebreton, *Histoire du Dogme de la Trinité*, i., 559-586). Like the priest-confessor just mentioned, He did know the fact, but the divine secret of the Day of Judgment belonged to God the Father, and formed no part of the mission He gave either to Christ or to His holy angels. In this sense He did not know it (Lagrange, *Evangile selon Saint Marc*, 327; *Cf.* Acts i. 7; St. Augustine, *De Trinitate*, i., 12; Ser. 97; St. Thomas, *Summa*, III., Q. 10, art. 2).

Catholic moralists divide secrets into three classes: the natural secret, which concerns our own private life, or the hidden faults of our neighbor; the entrusted secret, which refers to matters communicated to us under promise of secrecy; the professional secret, which pertains to facts told to priests, lawyers, doctors, and public officials.

It is not only lawful, but it is in most instances obligatory for us to keep these secrets inviolate. When impertinent people, either maliciously or stupidly, endeavor to wrest these secrets from us, we are perfectly justified in using a mental reservation to meet their rude and ill-bred questioning.

Apart, however, from the confessional secret, which binds always and under all circumstances, because of the divine law, there are certain cases when secrets must needs be divulged. A natural or an entrusted secret, for example, must be told, if a legitimate court authority demand it, to prevent injury to a third party or to the community in general. Even the professional secret loses its binding force, if keeping it implies the violating of a higher precept. Thus a doctor, who knows privately that a boy at a boarding school has a serious case of smallpox that will infect the other students, is bound to inform the city's health board. Or again a doctor, who knows that a patient of his, suffering from syphilis, is determined to marry a girl without informing her of the fact, is in duty bound to warn the prospective bride of the danger to her and her possible offspring. Common sense tells us that if the literal observance of a professional secret would work great injury to either the private or general welfare, it must be disregarded as far as is necessary (*H.*, March, 1929).

"Mental reservation, therefore," writes Father Rickaby, "is allowable only when we are driven into a corner by captious questions about a matter which we have a grave reason and a right to keep secret, and where we have no other escape" (*Political and Moral Essays*, 225). Lax opinions regarding its use were condemned by Pope Innocent XI, March 2, 1679 (Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, 1176-1178).

Bibliography: Cronin, *The Science of Ethics*, ii., 77; Mausbach, *Catholic Moral Teaching*, 215-233. D. A. iv. 957-982.—D. T. x. 555-569.

Do not the Jesuits teach that the end justifies the means?

The Jesuits in common with all Catholic moralists teach that a good end justifies a means that is either good or indifferent, but that a good end never justifies a means that is morally evil. With St. Paul all Catholics hold that "one cannot do evil that good may come" (Rom. iii. 8).

According to elementary Catholic ethics an action is good only if all its constituent parts are good; *i. e.*, the end, the means, and the circumstances of time, place and environment. If any one of these three sources of morality is bad, the action is evil. Let me illustrate this teaching by a few practical cases. If I give alms to a beggar out of charity (a good action), or play a piano concerto (an indifferent action) at Carnegie Hall for the benefit of a charitable institution, in both instances I am using a good or an indifferent means to a good end—the end justifies the means. But, on the contrary, if I give money

to a politician in order to obtain a city contract, I am perverting a good means to a bad end; if like Robin Hood of old I steal from the rich to donate an alms to the poor, I am serving a good end with a bad means; if finally, I give my monies to a city hospital to be honored by men, that circumstance robs my giving of all supernatural merit, as our Lord expressly taught (Matt. vi. 1, 2). In all three cases my action is morally bad.

If this calumny were true, why is it that bitter anti-Jesuits, like Pascal in the seventeenth and Döllinger in the nineteenth century, never dared mention it in their charges against Jesuit morality? If this calumny were true, why is it that no non-Catholic for the past four centuries has been able to point out this teaching in any approved author? The thousand florins offered by the Jesuit Father Roh in 1852, and the two thousand florins offered by the German deputy Dasbach in 1903 to anyone who would prove that this immoral principle was stated in any Jesuit book, has never been forfeited. The apostate Jesuit, Count von Hoensbroech took up the challenge in his book, *Der Zweck heiligt die Mittel,* and even appealed to the courts to claim the reward. The Court of first instance and the Cologne Court of Appeals both ruled against him, on the ground that the passages adduced from Jesuit authors did not contain the sentence, "the end justifies the means, either formally or materially" (Mausbach, *Catholic Moral Teaching,* iv.).

In sanctioning the polygamy of the Langrave, Philip of Hesse. Luther and his friends, Melanchthon and Buser, acted on the principle that a good end justifies a bad means. Luther's dispensation for Philip to marry Margaret von Sala was granted ostensibly to prevent the Landgrave's lapsing into adultery, but really to keep this licentious prince attached to the Lutheran cause. Besides, Luther urged him to keep the matter secret for fear of scandal, and if questioned on the matter to call his second wife his mistress. Deny the marriage publicly was the advice of both Bucer and Luther, for "what harm would it do if a man told a good, lusty lie (*eine gute starke Luge*) in a worthy cause, and for the sake of the Christian churches" (Grisar, *Luther,* iv., 51; Verres, *Luther,* 315).

I have frequently met physicians who falsely accused Catholics of the very immoral principle they carried out in their everyday practice. For they made no scruple of taking the life of an unborn child to save a mother's life, or of performing ovariotomy without sufficient cause. Every criminal is apt to think his innocent neighbor guilty of his own pet crime.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Gerard, *Does the End Justify the Means?;* Slater, *Moral Theology,* i., 24, 202. A. Q. 1888, 119.

THE SAFE-CONDUCT TO HUSS

Does not your Church teach that it is lawful to lie to Protestants? How can you expect us to believe you, when the Council of Constance explicitly decreed that "one is not bound to keep a promise made to a heretic" (Gieseler, *Kirchengeschicte,* ii., 417)? Was not the Council's safe-conduct to Huss violated on this principle?

The Catholic Church teaches that lying is intrinsically evil. It is a contradiction between thought and speech, which, if common, would prevent men from living together in mutual trust and confidence. It is forbidden by the Eighth Commandment (Exod. xx. 16), and condemned by the Old Law and the New (Lev. xix. 11; Prov. vi. 17; xiii. 22; John viii. 44; Eph. iv. 25; Apoc. xxi. 8). The calumny that it is lawful to lie to Protestants has been frequently refuted since the sixteenth century: By Lethmatius in 1544, by Copus in 1581, by Campion in 1608, by Rosweidt and Sweert in 1608 and 1611, by Becanus in 1612, and by Marquez in 1645 (*C. B.,* July, 1896).

The Council of Constance never granted a safe-conduct to Huss, and never passed the above bogus decree. In fact it expressly states: "The one who grants a safe-conduct must see that it is observed to the best of his power." The Council sets forth the ordinary teaching of canon law, that a prince's safe-conduct in no way prevented the ecclesiastical authority from trying and judging a heretic.

Huss left Prague, as he admits himself in three letters, without any written safe-conduct. The Emperor, Sigismund, however, granted him an escort of Bohemian nobles to ensure his safety on his way to the Council. The written safe-conduct was sent by the Emperor from Spire on October 18, and reached Constance on October 28, before the arrest of Huss. Both the Emperor and Huss' Bohemian friends considered his arrest before trial a clear violation of the Emperor's safe-conduct, and they, therefore, protested without effect to the Fathers of the Council. No one at the time believed that the Emperor's safe-conduct gave Huss a right to return to Prague, if he were condemned by the Council. There are many letters extant of the Emperor, the King of Aragon, the Bohemian nobles, and even of Huss himself, proving that the safe-conduct protected the bearer from all illegal violence on his journey, but that it did not free him from the consequences of justice.

It is true that in two letters Huss asserts that the Emperor did promise verbally "to send him back safe and sound to Bohemia" But Huss is either lying, or he mistook the meaning

of the Emperor's words. "Such a promise," as Palacky says "would not only have been beyond the Emperor's rights and competence, but also beyond his power" (*Geschichte von Böhmen,* iii., 357).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Alzog, *Church History,* ii., 964; Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles,* vii., 340-350. D. T. iii. 1200-1224.

THE MONITA SECRETA

Is not the true spirit of the Jesuits revealed in the Monita Secreta, or Secret Instructions of the Jesuits?

No, for the Monita Secreta is a deliberate, calumnious forgery, written by an expelled Polish Jesuit, Jerome Zahorowski, and published at Cracow in 1614. It was denounced as a forgery by the Congregation of the Index at Rome within two years of its publication, and Jesuit scholars like Father Gretser in 1617, and Father Huylenbrowcq in 1713, proved that on every page it contradicts the authentic instructions of Acquaviva, the fifth general of the Society, to whom it was impudently ascribed. The A. P. A. pseudo-Papal Encyclicals of the nineties and the bogus Knights of Columbus Oath, spread broadcast by anti-Catholic bigots in the United States during the Presidential campaign of 1928, are forgeries of similar character.

The Monita Secreta have been declared apocryphal by many non-Catholic writers, who certainly held no brief for the Jesuits; *viz.,* Döllinger, Friedrich, Gieseler, Huber, Lang and Reusch. During the debates on Catholic Emancipation in England one hundred years ago, more than one speaker denounced them as clean-cut forgeries.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Duhr, *Die Monita Secreta;* Gerard, *The Secret Instructions of the Jesuits.* M. July, Aug., 1873; March, 1902.—R. C. xxv. 660.

THE COMMANDMENTS OF THE CHURCH

Why do you put the laws of your Church on the same level as the Commandments of Sinai?

We do not. It is always forbidden by the law of God to commit perjury or to calumniate one's neighbor, whereas the obligation of the Church's law of fasting or of obligatory Mass attendance ceases, if one is old or sick. As the divine representative of Christ, the Catholic Church claims the right to make laws

that safeguard the faith (the prohibition of masonry), and promote the devotion and piety of her people (the laws of obligatory church attendance; the laws of fasting and abstinence).

As the divine guardian and interpreter of divine revelation, the Church naturally gives her laws the highest possible sanction of binding in conscience under sin, in order to discharge her office effectively. Her laws cease to bind, as soon as one has a valid excuse for not observing them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Villien, *History of the Commandments of the Church.*

Why are women required to wear a hat or a veil in a Catholic Church?

Because it is an Apostolic custom, as we learn from St. Paul's letter to the Church of Corinth (1 Cor. xi. 3-16). He strongly denounces the Christian women of Corinth for presuming to come to church unveiled, accusing them of pride and arrogance unsuited to their sex. For he argues that by nature and God's law, woman is subject to her husband, and that the wearing of a veil is a sign of her dependence. "The head of the woman is the man"; "the woman is the glory of the man"; "the woman was created for the man" (vv. 3, 7, 9). To pray in church unveiled is insulting to the angels (v. 10), and equivalent to having the head shaved (v. 5), a custom followed only by slaves in Greece, and by dancers and courtesans in Rome. After discussing the matter at some length, he ends by saying: "If any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, nor the Church of God" (v. 16). That is, if you cannot follow my subtle reasoning, let this suffice that you are going counter to the practice of all the other churches.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul,* i., 120-122.

HOLYDAYS

Did not your Church in the Middle Ages have fifty or more holydays, thus fostering laziness among the people? Did not St. Paul object to the frequency of holydays among the Galatians: "Ye observe days, and months, and times and years" (Gal. iv. 10)?

It is true that the number of holydays did amount to forty in medieval Hungary and fifty in medieval France, but the object of the local Bishops was to lighten the burdens of the poor, and give them ample time for recreation and the practice of their religion. When complaints were made to Rome about

their frequency their number was reduced, so that at the time of the Concordat in France (1801) only four feasts were retained with the obligation of hearing Mass and abstaining from servile labor: Christmas, the Ascension, the Assumption and All Saints. In the United States we have but six holydays, the Feast of the Circumcision and the Immaculate Conception being added to the four just mentioned. Pope Urban VIII in his Bull *Universa* writes: "The number of these feasts begets lukewarmness among Christians. Nay more, the poor clamorously lament that the excessive multiplication of feast days deprives them of the means of subsistence; while others take advantage of it to abandon themselves to an idleness that is full of perils. . . . By indulging in worldly and pernicious pleasures they change what was instituted to facilitate their eternal salvation into occasions of sin and damnation."

St. Paul was not finding fault with the Old Law's observance of holydays and feasts such as the Sabbath (Exod. xx. 10), the New Moon (1 Par. xxiii. 31), the Passover (Exod. xii. 6), Tabernacles (Lev. xxiii. 34), or the Jubilee and Sabbatical year (Exod. xxiii. 11; Lev. xxvii.), but he was condemning the Judaizers, who were insisting on Christians observing the feasts and practices of the obsolete Jewish law. He says: "How turn you again to the weak and needy elements, which you desire to observe again" (Gal. iv. 9).

Bibliography: C. W. xxxv. 665.

EASTER

What is the difference between the Jewish Pasch and the Christian Easter? Why is Easter not kept on the same day every year?

The Jewish Pasch commemorated the Jewish Exodus from Egypt under Moses. It was kept on the fourteenth Nisan, and fell by turns on each day of the week.

The Christian Easter from Apostolic times commemorated the Resurrection of Christ, and was always kept on a Sunday (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, v., 23). The Council of Nice decreed that this Sunday must follow the fourteenth day of the Paschal moon, *i. e.*, the moon whose fourteenth day followed the spring equinox. According to this rule, Easter Sunday is the first Sunday which occurs after the fourteenth day following March 21. The earliest possible date for Easter is March 22, the latest April 25.

Bibliography: Guéranger, *The Liturgical Year*, i. C. E. v. 224-230.—C. W. lviii. 808.—D. April, 1924.—R. C. lxix. 513.—T. March 12, June 4, June 11, 1921.

ABSTINENCE

Why do Catholics refrain from eating meat on Fridays? Does not Christ say: "Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man" (Matt. xv. 11)? Does not St. Paul call "abstaining from meats a doctrine of devils" (1 Tim. i. 1, 3)? Does not St. Paul say: "Whatsoever is sold in the shambles," *i. e.*, meat market, "that eat, asking no question for conscience' sake" (1 Cor. x. 25)?

The Catholic law of abstaining from meat on Fridays in honor of our Lord's Crucifixion on that day is mentioned by *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (viii.), by Tertullian (*De Jejunio,* xiv.), and by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.,* vi., 75). The mere eating of meat is of course not sinful, for "every creature of God is good, and nothing to be rejected that is received with thanksgiving" (1 Tim. iv. 4), but to eat meat in defiance of a law of God's Church is a grievous sin of disobedience to a divine society, which prescribes it for our spiritual good. St. Augustine says that abstinence "purifies the soul, elevates the mind, and subordinates the flesh to the spirit" (*De Orat. et Jejun.,* Ser. 230).

It is indeed sinful to abstain from meat because one believes with the early Gnostics that flesh is evil in itself (1 Tim. i. 3), or with the Brahmins that one may possibly be eating his own grandmother.

Our Lord (Matt. xv. 11) was rebuking the Pharisees for their externalism, "who made clean the outside of the cup, but within were full of rapine and uncleanness" (Matt. xxiii. 25). The malice of sin lies in the corrupt heart and the disobedient will (Matt. xv. 19).

A good deal of the meat sold in the markets at Corinth came from the heathen sacrifices. If in eating this meat scandal were given either to Jew or pagan, St. Paul orders the Christian "not to eat of it, for his sake that told it, and for conscience sake" (1 Cor. x. 28).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Koch, *Handbook of Moral Theology,* iv., 348-374. C. E. i. 67-73.—D. L. i. 207.—D. T. i. 261-277.

FASTING

What is the good of fasting? Does not your Church ask too much of human nature by her fasting laws? What is the difference between abstinence and fasting?

Abstinence means to refrain from meat on certain prescribed days, while fasting implies that only one full meal may be

taken in the day. On fast days a Catholic may eat a scanty breakfast, consisting of bread or toast with coffee or tea, together with a slight collation in the evening. The early Christians adopted the Jewish custom of taking but one meal at sunset, but this long fasting was found too severe for the average man. The Church, therefore, has wisely modified her law to meet modern conditions. No one under twenty-one or over sixty is bound to fast, and a dispensation is always granted for just reasons.

Fasting is frequently commended in both the Old and the New Testament. In the Old Law we have the example of Moses (Exod. xxxiv. 28; Deut. ix. 9, 18), of David (2 Kings xii. 16), of Elias (3 Kings xix. 8), and of the Jewish people in general (2 Par. xx. 3; 1 Esdras viii. 21; 2 Esdras ix. 1; Esther iv. 16; Joel ii. 15). In the New Law we have the example of St. John the Baptist (Matt. iii. 4), of our Lord Himself (Matt. iv. 2), and of the Apostles (Acts xiii. 3; xiv. 22).

Mere fasting is not in itself pleasing to God (Luke xviii. 12), but when performed in obedience to Christ's Church, it means self-denial and the following of Christ (Matt. iv. 2; Luke ix. 23), it brings the body into subjection (1 Cor. ix. 27; Gal. v. 24), and prepares the soul for the grace of the Holy Spirit (Acts xiii. 2, 3). St. Ambrose called fasting "the death of sin, the root of grace, and the foundation of chastity" (*De Elia et Jejunio*, ch. iii., 2).

Bibliography: Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, 231-243, 285-290; Hallett, *Penance and Fasting;* Slater, *A Manual of Moral Theology*, i., 361; Thurston, *Lent and Holy Week.* C. E. v. 789.—D. A. ii. 153-158.—D. T. x. 1411-1417.

THE EMBER DAYS

What do Catholics mean by the Ember Days?

The Ember Days are the Wednesdays, Fridays and Saturdays at the beginning of the four seasons, which the Church appointed as special days of fasting and abstinence. The word is derived from the Latin, *Quatuor Tempora*, the four times.

While their origin is uncertain, it is generally believed that they were instituted to offset the pagan customs of the fifth century in Rome. The Romans, at the beginning of the time of seeding and harvesting, performed certain religious ceremonies to implore the help of their gods: in June for a good harvest, in September for a rich vintage, and in December for the seed-

ing. The Church Christianized this pagan custom, and set aside these seasons as special times of prayer and thanksgiving.

They are first mentioned by Pope Leo the Great (440-461), who declares they are of Apostolic origin, although there is no proof whatever of his assertion. From his time the ordinations of the clergy were held on these days. Of the six official ordinations, three were in Lent: on Ember Saturday, the Saturday before Passion Sunday, and on Holy Saturday.

Bibliography: Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* 232.

What is the meaning of Lent?

While the fast of Good Friday and Holy Saturday was the Church's preparation for Easter, the forty days of Lent (from the first Sunday of Lent to Good Friday) were, according to St. Leo and St. Augustine, the Church's annual retreat, urging Catholics to share in the solemn commemoration of our Redemption by our Lord's death on the Cross. The forty days were suggested by the fasting of Moses, Elias, and especially of our Lord (Exod. xxiv. 28; 3 Kings xix. 8; Matt. iv.; *Cf.* Matt. ix. 14, 15).

Lent is first mentioned in the fifth canon of the Council of Nice (325), and in the Festal Letters of St. Athanasius (Letter to Bishop Serapion of Thmuis, written from Rome in 341).

In the early Church the fast was most strict, permitting of one meal a day, which was not taken until four o'clock. The clergy and people of Rome gathered together for the Collects and Stations, and went in procession to the Stational Church, where they heard the Pope's Mass and received Communion. During Lent the penitents performed their public penance until Holy Thursday, when they were reconciled to the Church by the Bishop. The catechumens were instructed for their Baptism on Holy Saturday.

The Lenten liturgy, compiled between the years 461 to 596, gives evidence on every page of the trials and sufferings of the Roman Christians. During this period Rome was besieged and sacked repeatedly by Vandals, Goths, Huns and Lombards, while flood, famine and pestilence were of frequent occurrence. The appeals for mercy, for forgiveness of sins, and for deliverance from trial and suffering so often met with in the Lenten liturgy, came from the hearts of priests and bishops who were being tried to the utmost. The Church's official prayer book, the Roman Missal, ought to be in the hands of every Catholic during the Lenten season.

Bibliography: Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* 241; Thurston, *Lent and Holy Week.* D. T. ii. 1724-1750.—R. C. March 5, 1904.—T. March 1—April 5, 1924.

How often are Catholics obliged to go to Confession?

Catholics are obliged to confess all their sins once a year, as soon as they have reached the age of discretion, *i. e.*, about the seventh year (Canon 906). This law dates from the Council of Lateran (1215), and was reaffirmed at the Council of Trent (Sess. xiv., can. 8), which expressly denounced the Reformers for their calumny in assigning the origin of the Sacrament of Penance to the thirteenth century (Sess. xiv., ch. 5).

How often are Catholics bound to receive Communion?

Catholics are obliged to receive the Holy Eucharist once a year, at least during Easter time, *i. e.*, from Palm Sunday to Low Sunday (Canon 859). By special permission the Easter time in the United States has been lengthened from the First Sunday of Lent to Trinity Sunday. This precept remains binding even after the lapse of the prescribed term.

How much money is a Catholic supposed to contribute to the support of his church and pastor? May a priest refuse his services to those who refuse to pay the usual fee?

The obligation to support one's pastor is a grave obligation, which is set forth as a divine precept in both the Old Law and the New. St. Paul says: "Know you not that they who work in the holy place eat the things that are of the holy place; and they that serve the altar partake with the altar? So also the Lord ordained that they who preach the Gospel should live by the Gospel" (1 Cor. ix. 13, 14).

In English-speaking countries to-day the offerings of the faithful are almost the only source of church revenue, a far better system than the old tithe system, which was the occasion of many an abuse. The Catholic people are bound by divine precept to support their church and pastor according to their means, the amount depending upon the needs of a particular parish, and the income of the particular parishioner. No priest is allowed to deny the Sacraments or the ministrations of the Church to the poor, or to charge them for entering church to hear Mass (Canon 1181).

ABBREVIATIONS OF REVIEWS QUOTED

A. N.—Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne.
A. Q.—The American Catholic Quarterly.
B.—Blackfriars.
C. B.—The Catholic University Bulletin.
C. C.—Civilta Cattolica.
C. E.—The Catholic Encyclopedia.
C. W.—The Catholic World.
D.—The Dublin Review.
D. A.—Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi.
D. B.—Dictionnaire de la Bible.
D. L.—Dictionnaire d'Archaéologie et Liturgie.
D. T.—Dictionnaire de la Théologie Catholique.
E.—The Ecclesiastical Review.
E. H.—The English Historical Review.
E. T.—Etudes.
H.—The Homiletic Review.
H. J.—The Hibbert Journal.
I. T.—The Irish Theological Quarterly.
M.—The Month.
R. A.—La Revue Apologétique.
R. B.—La Revue Biblique.
R. C.—Revue du Clergé Français.
R. E.—Revue Benedictine.
R. J.—Revue des Jeunes.
R. M.—Revue des Deux Mondes.
R. Q.—Revue des Questions Historiques.
R. S.—Revue des Questions Scientifiques.
S.—Studies.
S. T.—Stimmen aus Maria Laach.
T.—The Tablet.

GENERAL INDEX

A

Abercius, The Epitaph of, 154.
Abstinence, 440.
  Total, 280.
Act of Supremacy, Elizabeth's, 140.
  of Uniformity, Elizabeth's, 140.
Adonis, 355.
Age of the Human Race, 72.
Agnosticism, 4.
Agnus Dei, The, 351.
Aionios, 383.
Alb, 274.
Albigenses, The Teaching of the, 195, 196.
  The Crusade against the, 194.
Alexander VI, 176.
  and the Bull Inter Cætera, 164.
Alleged Atheistic Tribes, 8.
Allegiance, Catholics and Civil, 184.
Alpha and Omega, 347.
Angelus, The, 368.
Angels, 369.
Amice, the, 274.
Anathema, 205.
Anglican Church, origin of the, 140.
  not Catholic, 130.
  and Branch Theory, 106.
  and Continuity, 135.
Anglican Orders, Invalid, 307.
Animals, cruelty to, 421.
Annulments, 331.
  of the Rota, 332.
Anthropomorphism, 4.
Antichrist, 157.
Antipodes, 174.
Anti-Popes, 119, 161.
Antiquity of Man, 72.
Apocrypha, the So-called, 63.
Apocryphal Gospels, 46.
Apostles, not all Equal, 146.
  Dispute of the, 151.
Apostolicity, of the Church, 134.
Apollonia, St., Alleged Suicide of, 419.
Arianism, 112.
Articles, the Forty-two, 139.
  The Thirty-nine, 140.
Asceticism, 311.
Ashes, Blessed, 350.
Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, 361.
Astrology, 401.
Atheism, 3.
Atonement, the Doctrine of, 59-62.
  Is it Unjust?, 62.
Attendance at Non-Catholic Services, 218.
Attributes of God, 5.
Authenticity of the Vulgate, 69.
Authority in Religion, 34, 36.

B

Baptism, 100, 228.
  by non-Catholics, 237.
  Clinical, 240.
  Conditional, 87, 238, 245.
  of St. John the Baptist, 238.
  by Immersion, 239-241.
  in the Name of Jesus, 241.
  of Desire and of Blood, 242.
  the Necessity of, 242.
  Efficacy of, 245.
  Infants dying without, 243, 391.
  of Infants, 243.
  for the Dead, 244.
  Sponsors at, 244.
  Christian Names Given at, 244.
  The Efficacy of, 245.
Baptismal Controversy, The, 155, 238.
Bartholomew's Day, St., 198-201.
Being, The Idea of, 4.
Believe, Why Men Do Not, 101.
Bells, The Blessing of, 351.
Benediction, of the Blessed Sacrament, 262.
Betting, The Ethics of, 277.
Béziers, The Siege of, 196.
Bible, The Canon of the Old Testament, 62.
  The Inspiration of, 64.
  Criteria of Inspiration, 65, 66.
  Inerrancy, 67.
  Not the Sole Rule of Faith, 76.
  and Tradition, 77-80.
  in the Middle Ages, 82.
  of Luther, 81.
  of Wyclif, 83.
  of Tyndal, 83.
  Translations of the, 81.
  Reading of the, 83, 84.
  in the Public Schools, 85.
  Chained, 86.
Bigamy of the Landgrave of Hesse, 171, 325, 429, 433.
Biretta, 274.
Birth Control, 339-342.
Bishop and Presbyter in the New Testament, 306.
Bishops, Jurisdiction of, 157.
Bismarck and Censorship, 206.
Blessed Virgin, Mother of God, 352.
  Virginity of, 353-357.
  Immaculate Conception of, 358-360.
  The Assumption of, 361.
  Not Adored, 362.
  Sinlessness of, 360.
  Devotion to, 100, 362, 370.
  Legends of, 363.

Blessed Virgin, Biblical Objections to Veneration of, 365.
Blue Laws, 409.
Boniface VIII, Pope, and Dissection, 116.
Book of Common Prayer, 138.
Books on the Index, 206.
Borah, Senator, and the Constitution, 279.
Branch Theory, The, 106.
Brethren of Jesus, The, 354.
Breviary, The, 348.
British Church, The, and Rome, 141.
Buddhism, 21.
Burial, Christian, 208.

C

Cain, Wife of, 71.
Calixtus III, Pope, and Halley's Comet, 116.
Candles, Blessed, 345.
Canon of the Old Testament, 62.
Capital Punishment, 420.
Capitalism, The Evils of, 417.
Card Playing, The Ethics of, 277.
Casuistry, 128.
Catacomb Frescoes, and Inscriptions, 371, 395.
Catherine de Médicis, and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, 199.
Catholic and Protestant Nations Compared, 126.
Catholic, First Used, 132.
Catholicity of the Church, 129-133.
Catholics, Number of, in World, 131.
Celibacy, of the Clergy, 310-318.
  not Impossible or Unnatural, 314.
  Biblical Objections to, 316, 317.
  Does Not Belittle Marriage, 318.
Ceremonies, 342-344.
Character, The Sacramental, 87.
Charity, the Bond of, 118.
Charlemagne and the Saxons, 189.
Chasuble, 274.
Christ, The Divinity of, 51-59.
  in the Synoptics, 51.
  in St. John, 53.
Christian Science, 23.
Chronology, Biblical, 72.
Church, The, and the Bible, 62-86.
  Conditions of Membership, 86.
  a Divine Society, 89.
  and Union with God, 100.
  Perpetuity of, 90.
  and the Reformation, 90-92.
  Visibility of, 93.
  Infallibility of, 95.
  not a Despotism, 98.
  and Reason, 33-36.
  and Personal Religion, 96.
  and Conscience, 7, 10, 101.
  Unity of, 103.
  Why Non-Catholics do not Join the, 101.
  The Eastern Orthodox, 107, 108-111, 130, 234, 240, 272, 282.
Church, The, and Science, 35, 74, 114-116, 175, 181.
  The Holiness of, 120.
  Wicked Members of, 124-126.
  Catholicity of, 129-133.
  Number of Adherents, 131.
  Apostolicity of, 133.
  Early, British, 141.
  and Civil Allegiance, 185.
  and State, 187.
  in the Middle Ages, 188.
  and Education, 213.
  Obligation of Attending, 410.
  Obligation of Laws, 437.
Churches, Cost of, 344.
  The Lesser Eastern, 108, 130, 282.
Churching of Women, The, 346.
Cincture, 273.
Civil Law, Obligation of the, 186.
Colors, Liturgical, 275.
Comet, Halley's, 117.
Commandments, Division of the, 372.
  of the Church, 437-443.
Commandments—
  The First, 397-408.
  The Second, 371, 408, 409.
  The Third, 410, 411.
  The Fourth, 88, 412-418.
  The Fifth, 419-428.
  The Sixth, 428.
  The Seventh, 429-430.
  The Eighth, 430-437.
Common Prayer, Book of, 138.
Communion, 100, 229, 256.
  Frequent, 256.
  Effects of, 257.
  Under One Kind, 259.
  Annual, 256, 443.
  Of Saints, 393.
  Fasting, 262.
Communism, Alleged, in the Bible and the Fathers, 414.
Comprehensiveness, 104, 107.
Conception, The Immaculate, 358-360.
Confession, the meaning of John xx., 280, 287.
  and the Council of Lateran, 281.
  The Fathers on, 282-286.
  not Optional, 286.
  in the Eastern Orthodox Church, 282.
  and the Power of Priests, 288.
  does not Corrupt the Mind, 288.
  The Secret of, 289.
  Does not Weaken Character, 290.
  Not an Incentive to Sin, 290.
  Not Degrading or Unmanly, 291.
  Money Not Paid for, 291.
  Not too Difficult, 291.
  Annual, 256, 282, 443.
Confirmation, 246, 247.
  and the Lutheran Oath, 87.
Conscience, 7, 10, 101, 185.
  a Proof of God's Existence, 3.
Constance, The Council of, and Communion, 259.

Constance, The Council of, and John Huss, 436.
Contemplative Orders, 318.
Continuity Theory, The, 135.
Contract, Freedom of, 413.
Contract, Rousseau's Social, 416.
Contrition, Perfect and Imperfect, 292.
  Necessity of, 292.
Convents, and Public Inspection, 321.
Conversion, The Nature of, 21.
  Hindrances to, 87, 88, 102.
Converts, and the Profession of Faith, 87.
  Obligations of, 86.
Cope, The, 274.
Cost of Churches, 343.
Council, General, Not Supreme, 162.
  of Jerusalem, The, 152.
Cranmer, 139, 204.
Creation, 5, 69.
  Six Days of, The, 69.
Creed, The Apostles, 107, 113, 377, 378.
  Athanasian, 48, 107, 113, 377, 378.
  Nicene, The, 107, 113, 377, 378.
Cremation, 208.
Cross, The Sign of the, 348.
  Stations of the, 347.
  Adoration of, 349.
  Relics of the True, 374.
  Discovery of the True, 374.
Crozier, The, 274.
Crusades, The, 175.
Cures of Christian Science, 24.
Cyprian, St., and Pope Stephen, 155, 238.

D

Dalmatic, The, 274.
Dancing, 276.
Dante, not on the Index, 207.
Death, 377.
Deaconesses in the Early Church, 309.
Decretals, The False, 159.
Deluge, The, 73.
Deposition of Civil Rulers, 183.
Descent of Man, 10.
Design, The Argument from, 2.
Determinism, 17.
Deutero-Canonical Books, 63.
Development of Doctrine, 111.
Devil, The, 381.
Devotions to the Sacred Heart, 48.
Diet of Worms, The, Luther at, 196.
Diet of Spires, 133.
Dionysius of Alexandria, 166.
Dispensations, of the Pope, 171.
  of Marriage, 336.
Dispute of the Apostles, 151.
Dissection and Pope Boniface VIII, 116.
Dissolution of the English Monasteries, 323.
Divine Right of Kings, The, 415.
Divinity of Christ, The, 51-57.
Divinity of Christ, in the Synoptics, 51-54.
  in St. John 55-57.
Divorce, Absolutely Forbidden. 326-328.
  The Fathers on, 328.
  of Napoleon, 333.
  of Jerome Bonaparte, 333.
Doctors and Medicine, 25.
Dragonnades of Louis XIV, The, 189.
Dreams, 406.
Duelling, 407.
Dunkards, The, 239.

E

Easter, 439.
  The Controversy over, 155.
  Duty, 256, 443.
Edict of Nantes, The Revocation of the, 201.
Education and the Church, 213-215.
Elizabeth of England, 140.
Ember Days, 441.
Emotional Religion, 21, 37.
End, a Good, does not Justify a Bad Means, 431, 434.
Environment and Religion, 20.
Episcopacy, 306.
Episcopate, The Monarchial, 306.
Equivocation, 430.
Eucharist, The Holy, 247-275.
  in St. John, 248-250.
  in the Fathers, 250.
  in the Gospels and St. Paul, 251-253.
  Objections, Against, 253-259.
Eugenics, The Church and, 422-426.
Evangelical Counsels, The, 312, 318.
Evil, The Problem of, 11-14.
Evolution, 8-10, 16.
Excommunication, 205.
  of Queen Elizabeth, 185.
Extreme Unction, 299.
  The Fathers on, 301.
  The Effects of, 302.

F

Faith, Hindrances to, 38.
  The Idea of, 20, 21, 31, 37-39.
  and Reason, 33, 36, 98, 115.
  Nature and Certainty of, 337.
  and Mysteries in Religion, 34-36.
  The Rule of, 76-80, 134.
  and the Will, 37.
  of the Learned and the Simple, 111.
  Necessity of, 30, 32.
  Alone does not Justify, 223.
  and the Grace of God, 38.
Fall, The Doctrine of the, 219.
False Decretals, The, 159.
Fasting, 440.
  Before Communion, 262.
Father, a Title for Priests, 310.
Festivals, 438.
Flesh and Spirit in the New Testament, 250.

Foreknowledge of God and Hell, 386.
Forty Hours' Devotion, The, 263.
Fraternal Correction, 153.
Freedom of Thought, 97.
Freemasonry, 210.
Free Will, 16.
Fundamental and non-Fundamental Doctrines, 117.

G

Galileo, The Condemnation of, 74, 179-182.
and the Fable of "e pur se muove,"*182, 196.
Gambling, The Ethics of, 277.
Genealogies of Christ, 357.
Genuflection, 262.
God, The Basis of Morals, 7.
Nature and Existence of, 1-6.
The Universal Belief in, 3.
The Providence of, 11.
Wills all to be Saved, 75, 95, 123, 217, 276, 385, 386.
God's Foreknowledge and Hell, 386.
Good Works, 223.
Gospels, The, Genuine and Authentic, 45.
Grace, 221.
Gregory I, and The Title of Universal Bishop, 158.
XII, and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, 199.
Grosseteste, Bishop, and Papal Supremacy, 136.

H

Halley's Comet, 116, 117.
Heart, Sacred, Devotion to the, 48.
Heaven, 391.
and Earth Shall Pass, 392.
Hedonism, 7.
Hell, 381-391.
and the Goodness of God, 385.
and the Prescience of God, 386.
The Pains of, 388.
not Excessive Punishment, 388.
in this Life, 389.
and the Spirit of the Age, 389.
Christ's Descent into, 390.
and the Old Testament, 382.
in the New Testament, 382.
Henry IV, Marriage Annulment of, 332.
IV, and the Edict of Nantes, 201.
VIII, and the English Monasteries, 323.
VIII, Divorce of, 138.
Holiness of the Church, 120.
of the Church and Bad Members, 124.
Holydays, 438.
Holy Ghost, The Sin Against the, 276.
Water, 349.
Honorius, Pope, The Condemnation of, 173.
Huguenots, The Massacre of, 198, 201.
Huss and His Safe-Conduct, 436
Hypnotism, 404.

I

I. H. S., The Meaning of, 347.
Images and Pictures, 370-372.
in the Old Testament, 371.
Immaculate Conception, The, 358.
Immersion, 239-241.
Immortality of the Soul, 11, 18, 19, 403.
Immuring of Nuns, The, 323.
Implicit Quotations, 68.
Imputed Righteousness, Luther's Theory of, 225.
Incarnation, The, 47.
Incense, 345.
Independent Morality, 6.
Index, The Roman, 206.
Indifferentism, 26-32.
not in the Bible, 32.
Indulgences, 293.
The Meaning of, 293.
"A Culpa et Pœna," 294.
By What Authority Granted?, 295.
Pretended Sale of, 295-297.
and Tetzel, 296.
of the Dead, 297.
Efficacy of, 298.
of One Hundred Days, 298.
Inerrancy of the Bible, 67.
Implicit Quotations, in the Bible, 68.
Infallibility, of the Church, 95.
of the Pope, 168-184.
and Impeccability, 170, 171, 176.
and Inspiration, 171.
Innocent III, Pope, and the Albigensian Crusade, 194.
XI, and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, 201.
Inquisition, The Papal, 190.
The Spanish, 197.
I. N. R. I., The Meaning of, 347.
Inspiration, of the Bible, 64.
Criterion, The, of, 65.
Protestant Criteria of, 66.
Intention, The Doctrine of, 237.
Interest, The Ethics of, 429.
Intolerance, The Charge of, 189-213.
of the Reformers, 193.

J

James, St., and the Council of Jerusalem, 152.
Jerusalem, The Council of, 152.
Jesuits, The Suppression of, 182.
and the Monita Secreta, 437.
The Morals of, 128.
Jesus Christ, The Messias, 50.
The Divinity of, 51-57.
The Dereliction on the Cross, 57.
and the Title "Good," 58.
The Temptation of, 58.
The Redemption, 59-62.
The One Mediator, 370.

Joan, St., of Arc, 177.
Pope, The Fable of, 160.
Jonas, 75.
Josue, The Miracle of, 74.
Jubilee, The, 298.
Judgment, Particular and General, 377.
Justification, 223-225.
by Faith Alone, 28, 223, 224.

K

Knights of Columbus, The Bogus Oath of, 409.
Krishna, 356.

L

Landgrave of Hesse, The Bigamy of, 171, 325, 431, 435.
Latin, in the Liturgy, 272.
Vulgate, The, 68.
Law, Civil, and Morals, 7.
Lent, 442.
Liberius, Pope, 172.
Liberty of Thought, 97.
Limbo of the Fathers, 390.
of the Children, 390.
Legends of the Saints, 363.
Liturgy, The Lenten, 442.
Living Wage, The, 412.
Lord's Prayer, The Ending of, 399.
Louis XIV, The Dragonnades of, 189.
Lourdes, The Miracles of, 26, 41, 43, 44, 123, 375.
Love, of God, The, 88, 292.
of the Brethren, 88.
Lying, never Lawful, 430.
not Lawful to Heretics, 435.
Lynching of heretics in the Middle Ages, 191.

M

Magic, 232.
Manipels, The, 274.
Marriage, What Constitutes, 324.
The Fathers on, 325.
a Lay Sacrament, 329.
Morganatic, 330.
Church's Control over, 330.
Dispensations, 336.
Between Baptized and non-Baptized, 337.
Before a Minister or Justice, 336, 337.
of Relatives, 338.
in Lent and Advent, 338.
Annulments, 331-335.
Marlborough-Vanderbilt, 332.
Marconi-O'Brien, 332.
Borgia-Sforza, 332.
Louis XII—Jeanne Valois, 333.
Henry IV—Marguerite de Valois, 333.
Marriages, Mixed, 335.
Martyrs, The, 29, 122.
Mary Tudor, 139, 203.
Mass, Evening, 262.
What is the, 263-265.
of the Presanctified, 261.
a true Sacrifice, 264.
Mass, in the Bible, 265.
in the Fathers, 266-268.
not derogatory to the Sacrifice of the Cross, 268.
Prayers at, 269.
and the Souls in Purgatory, 270
Stipends, 271.
in Latin, 272.
Obligation of Attending, 410.
Vestments used at, 273.
Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, The, 198-201.
Medals, 401.
Mental Prayer, 400.
Reservation, 432-434.
Merit, 225-228.
Middle Ages, Bible in the, 82
Monks of the, 320.
Millennium, The, 380.
Miracles, The, of Christ, 25.
and the Laws of Nature, 41
and an Unchangeable God, 42
All Religions Claim, 44.
at Lourdes, 26, 41, 43, 44, 123, 375.
and the Wisdom of God, 42.
Why Cannot all Priests Perform?, 26, 288.
how proved?, 43.
have not ceased, 44, 122, 372.
Pagan, 44.
of the Saints, 44, 364, 374.
Mithra, 355.
Mitre, The, 274.
Monarchical Episcopate, The, 306
Money, for Masses, 271.
not given for Confession, 291.
for Churches, 343.
Monita Secreta, 437.
Monks, Medieval, 320.
and Nuns, 323.
Monograms, Christian, 347.
Mortal Sin, 275.
Mozzetta, The, 274.
Mysteries in Religion, 34-38.

N

Nag's Head Tavern, The Fable of 309.
Nantes, Revocation of the Edict of, 201.
Napoleon, the Divorce of, 333.
Jerome, the Divorce of, 333.
Nestorianism, 112.
Ne Temere Decree, 337.
Non-Resistance, The Principle of, 427.
Nuns, Escaped, 322.

O

Oath, The Bogus, of the Knights of Columbus, 409.
Oaths, The Morality of, 87, 408.
Occasions of Sin, The, 276-278.
Ordeals, Medieval, 406-408.
Orders, Holy, The Sacrament of, 303-309.
Holy, in the Fathers, 305.
not given to Women, 309.

Orders, Anglican, Invalid, 139, 307.
Religious, 318.
Ordinal, The Edwardine, 139, 307, 308.
Original Sin, 219.
Osiris, 356.
Ouija-Board, The, 403.
"Outside the Church no Salvation," 216.
Overpopulation, The Theory of, 340.

P

Pagans, The Salvation of, 217.
Palms, Blessed, 350.
Pallium, The, 136, 274.
Pantheism, 5, 22, 24.
Parental Opposition to Conversion, 88.
Pascal, and the Jesuit Moral Teaching 128.
Pastors, The, Support of, 443.
Paul, St., Not Married, 317.
Pauline Privilege, The, 329.
Pelagianism, 221.
Penal Laws, The, 193.
Penance, The Sacrament of, 229, 280-293.
in the Bible, 280.
in the Early Church, 282-286.
Penitential Books, Medieval, 282.
Perfection, The Counsels of, 319.
Perjury, The Sin of, 408.
Perseverance, Final, 222.
Persecution, The Charge of, 189.
The Reformers on, 193.
Peter, St., in Rome, 143.
Bishop of Rome, 145.
The Primacy of, 145-156.
The Rock, 148.
The Mission to Samaria, 151.
St. Paul's Rebuke of, 152.
The Denial of, 171.
"Petros and Petra," 150.
Pilgrimages, 347, 375.
Pagan, 375.
Pilgrims' Signs, 401.
Pius X, On Frequent Communion, 257.
II, Pope, 163.
V, and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, 199.
Planchette, The, 404.
Polygamy, 325.
Pope, not Antichrist, 157.
Primacy of, 153-165.
in the Early Church, 154-156.
at Ephesus and Chalcedon, 162.
Nicholas I and the False Decretals, 159.
Fable of a Woman, 160.
Jurisdiction of, and Bishops, 158.
Not Subject to a General Council, 162.
Gregory I and the Title of Universal Bishop, 158.
Pius II, 163.
Calixtus III and Halley's Comet, 116-117.
Alexander VI, 164.
Pope, Infallibility of, The, 168.
Liberius, 172.
Honorius, 173.
and the Roman Question, 165.
and the Western Schism, 118 161.
Zachary and the Antipodes, 174.
Clement XIV and the Jesuits, 183.
and the Deposing Power, 183.
and Civil Allegiance, 186.
Popes, Wicked, 126, 164.
and Ordeals, 406.
Pray, How to, 399.
Prayer, 397-400.
Does not Inform God, 397.
Implies no change in God, 398.
Answers to, 398.
Set, 399.
Vocal, Mental and Contemplative, 400.
Repetitions in, 367.
to the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, 368-370.
for the Dead, 393.
Lord's, Ending of, 399.
Prayers, Primitive Liturgical, 399.
Præmunire, The Statue of, 137.
Pre-Adamites, 71.
Priests, All Christians not, 236, 305.
Probabilism, 128.
Profession, The, of Faith, 87.
Prohibition, 123, 198, 278, 423.
Property, Private, 415, 417.
Prosperity, The Argument of, 126-128.
Protestant, and Catholic Countries Compared, 127.
First Used, 133.
Services, Attendance at, 218.
Protestants, Number of, 131.
Providence, Divine, 12.
Provisors, Statue of, 137.
Psalms, not on Index, 206.
Psychoanalysis, 405.
Public Schools, and the Church, 213-215.
Public Opinion and Morals, 7.
Purgatory, 393-397.
and Indulgences, 297.
and the Mass, 394.
in the Fathers, 394.

R

Real Presence, The, 247-259.
Reason, Luther's Idea of, 99.
and Faith, 33-36.
Rebellion, The Right of, 417.
Redemption, The, 59-62.
Reformation, The Causes of the, 90-92.
Relics, 372.
of the True Cross, 374.
Religion, and Environment, 20.
Emotionalism in, 21.
Origin of, 7, 8.
Religions, Why So Many?, 32.
Religious Orders, 318.
Not Sects, 117.

Repetitions in Prayer, 367.
Reservation, Mental, 432-435.
Resurrection of the Body, 378-380.
Revelation, Necessity of, 19, 29, 36.
Revivals, 21.
Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, 201.
Righteousness, Imputed, 225.
Rochet, The, 274.
Rock, Is Peter the?, 148.
Romanist and Romish, Offensive Titles, 133.
Roman Catholic, 133.
Question, The, 165.
Rosary, The, 366-368.
Rule of Faith, The, 76-80, 134.

S

Sabbath, The Jewish, Changed, 409.
Sacramentals, 342.
Sacraments, The, 228-230.
Idea of, 228.
Efficacy of, 230.
not Magic, 232.
Matter and Form of, 228.
Sacramental Character, 87, 232.
not Hindrances to Religion, 229.
Repetition of, 233.
Number of the, 233.
Divine Institution of, 235.
Not Borrowed from Paganism, 236.
The Minister of the, 236.
Sacred Heart, Devotion to the, 48.
Safe-Conduct to Huss, 436.
Saints, Communion of, 393.
Veneration of the, 100.
Prayers to the, 100, 368.
Miracles of the, 374.
Legends of the, 45, 363.
Salvation, Outside the Church, 216.
of Pagans, 217.
No Infallible Surety of, 49, 222.
Samaria, The, Mission of St. Peter to, 151.
Satisfaction for Sin, 292.
Savonarola, not a Precursor of the Reformation, 92.
Scandals in the Church, 89, 124-126, 164.
Scapular, The, 352.
Schism, the Sin of, 106, 119.
The Great Western, 118, 161.
Schismatics, Eastern, Number of, in world, 131.
Schools, The Bible in the, 85.
Public, and the Church, 213.
Science, and the Church, 35, 74, 114-116, 174, 181.
and the Popes, 116, 117.
"Search the Scriptures," 77.
Secrets, Natural, Intrusted, Professional, 433, 434.
Secret Instruction of the Jesuits, 437.
of the Confessional, 289.
Separation of Church and State, 188.
Servile Work, 411.
Sex Hygiene in the Schools, 428.
Septuagint, The, 63, 67, 72.
Sheol, 382.
Sign of the Cross, The, 348.
Sin, The Idea of, 12, 275.
Original, 14, 219.
Mortal and Venial, 275.
Occasions of, 276.
The Unpardonable, 276, 286.
Sinners in the Church, 124-126, 164.
Sinlessness of the Blessed Virgin, 360.
Six Days of Creation, The, 69.
Sixtus VI, Pope, and the Spanish Inquisition, 189, 197.
Socialism, 412, 417, 418.
Social Question, The, 411.
Soul, The Nature of the, 15.
The Animal, 16.
Have Women a?, 14.
Immortality of the, 18, 19, 389, 403.
Sovereignty, Popular, 415.
Popular, and the French Revolution, 416.
Spanish Inquisition, The, 197.
Spiritism, 402-404.
Sponsors at Baptism, 244.
Stations of the Cross, The, 347.
Sterilization of the Unfit, The, 423-426.
Stole, The, 274.
Strikes, The Morality of, 413.
General and Sympathetic, 414.
Succession, Apostolic, The, 133.
Suffering, 13.
Suïcide, The Ethics of, 419.
of the Martyrs, 419.
Sunday Observance, 409-411.
Superstition, 26, 401-408.
Support of the Clergy, The, 443.
Suppression of the Jesuits, The, 182-183.
Syllabus, The, 187.
Symbolic Meaning of the Vestments, 273.

T

Temperance, The Virtue of, 280.
Temporal Power of the Popes, 165.
Prosperity and the Church, 126.
Punishment, 293, 295, 394, 396.
Tetzel on Indulgences, 296.
Theatre-going, 277.
Theosophy, 22.
Tiara, The, 274.
Tongues, The Gift of, 272.
Tradition, Divine, 77-80.
Transubstantiation, 255.
Trinity, The Blessed, 39.
Tunicle, The, 274.

U

Unity of the Church, The, 103.
Universalism of Origin, The, 384.
Usury, 429.
Utilitarianism, 7.

V

Venial Sin, 275.
Vespers, 348.
Vestments, The Sacred, 274.
Vicious Circle, The So-called, 80.
Victor, Pope, and the Easter Controversy, 155.
Virgin Birth, The, 353-357.
  Objections to, 355-357.
  not Borrowed from Paganism, 355.
Vivisection, 421.
Volstead Act, The, 279.
Vows, Religious, 319.
Vulgate, The Latin, 68.

W.

Wage, The Living, 412.
War, the Morality of, 426.
Washing of Feet, The Ceremony of the, 239.
Water, Holy, 349.
Western Schism, The Great, 118, 161.
Will, to Believe, The, 36.
  Freedom of the, 16.
William I and Papal Supremacy, 136.
Women, and the Council of Macon 14.
  in Church, 309, 438.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

REVISED 1950

A

Acton—The History of Freedom.
Adam—Christ Our Brother; The Spirit of Catholicism.
Addis-Arnold—A Catholic Dictionary.
Agius—Tradition and the Church.
Aiken—The Dhamma of Gotama.
Allard—Ten Lectures on the Martyrs.
Alès—Baptism and Confirmation.
Allies—Church and State; The Formation of Christendom; The Monastic Life; St. Peter, His Name and Office; The Throne of the Fisherman.
Almergessen—Christian Denominations.
Alzog—The History of the Church.
Amherst—The History of Catholic Emancipation.
Anger—The Mystical Body.
Anglin—The Eucharistic Fast.
Antony—St. Catherine of Siena; St. Joan of Arc; Cardinal Pole.
Arendzen—The Church Triumphant; Eternal Punishment; The Gospels; Men and Manners in Time of Christ; Reason and Religion; The Trinity; What Becomes of Our Dead; Whom Do You Say?
Attwater—Catholic Eastern Churches; Dissident Eastern Churches; Names and Name Days.
Augustine—A Commentary on Canon Law.
Augustine, St.—The City of God.
Ayrinhac—Legislation on the Sacraments; Marriage Legislation in the New Code.

B

Bachofen—Liturgical Law.
Bagshaw—The Credentials of the Catholic Church; The Church; The Threshold of the Catholic Church.
Baierl—Grace and Prayer; The Mass; The Sacraments; The Ten Commandments.
Bainvel—Devotions to the Sacred Heart; Faith and the Act of Faith: Is There Salvation Outside the Church?
Baker—A Modern Pilgrim's Progress.
Baker, Father—Holy Wisdom; Contemplative Prayer.
Balmes—European Civilization; Letters to a Sceptic.
Bandas—Biblical Questions; The Master Idea in St. Paul; Practical Problems in Religion.

Bardenhewer—Patrology.

Barnes—Bishop Barlow and Anglican Orders; The Early Church in the Light of the Monuments; The Holy Shroud; The Martyrdom of S.S. Peter and Paul; The Popes and the Ordinal.

Barret—Our Lady in the Liturgy.

Barry—The Papal Monarchy; The Tradition of Scripture.

Bartman—Purgatory.

Barton—The Holy Ghost.

Batiffol—Catholicism and Papacy; Primitive Catholicism; The Roman Breviary.

Baudot—The Roman Breviary.

Bede—Ecclesiastical History.

Bedoyère—Christian Crisis.

Belloc—Companion to Well's Outlines; Cranmer; The Crusades; Elizabeth; History of England; How the Reformation Happened; Joan of Arc; The Question and the Answer; Why I am a Catholic.

Bellord—Meditations on Dogma.

Belser—History of the Passion.

Bellward—Christian Science.

Benson—Christ in the Church; Christian Science; The City on a Hill; Confessions of a Convert; Papers of a Pariah; Paradoxes of Catholicism; Religion of the Plain Man.

Berington—The Faith of Catholics.

Berry—The Church of Christ.

Berthier—Compendium of Theology.

Betten—The Roman Index.

Bertrand—St. Augustine; Louis XIV.

Bertrin—Lourdes.

Besse—Light of Carmel; Science of Prayer.

Betowski—Spurs to Conversion.

Bible—Its History and Authenticity.

Bird—Commentary on the Psalms.

Birt—The Elizabethan Religious Settlement.

Biskupec—Our Sacrifice.

Bishop—Liturgica Historica.

Blackmore—The Angel World; Spiritism.

Blot—In Heaven We Know Our Own.

Blount—The Blessed Trinity.

Blunt—Listen, Mother of God.

Boedder—Natural Theology.

Boeser—Mass Liturgy.

Boissarie—Healing at Lourdes.

Bonomelli—On Religious Worship.

Bopp—Liturgical Education.

Boylan—The Difficulties of Mental Prayer; The Mystical Body; The Psalms; The Epistle to the Romans.

Bremond—Religions of Unbelief.

Breton—Communion of Saints; Blessed Trinity.

Bridgett—Our Lady's Dowry; The Ritual of the New Testament.

Britt—Hymns of the Breviary.

Brodrick—St. Robert Bellarmine.

Brosnan—God Infinite and Reason; God and Reason; The Sacrifice of the New Law.

Bruehl—Birth Control and Eugenics.
Brunhes—Faith.
Brunini—Whereon to Stand.
Bruno—St. John of the Cross.
Brunsmann—Fundamental Theology.
Bruyère—Spiritual Life and Prayer.
Budenz—This is My Story.
Bullough—The Catholic Church in the New Testament.
Burnett—Path Which led a Protestant Lawyer to the Church.
Burns—Growth and Development of the Catholic School System; Principles, Origin and Establishment of the Catholic School System.
Burrows—The Open Door.
Burton—Celestial Homespun; In No Strange Land.
Bussard—Meaning of the Mass.
Butler—Benedictine Monachism; Religions of Authority; The Vatican.
Butler-Thurston—Lives of the Saints.

C

Cabrol—The Layman's Liturgy; Liturgical Prayer; The Mass; Mass of the Western Rites; Prayer of the Early Christians; The Year's Liturgy.
Callan—The Epistles of St. Paul; The Gospels; Our Lady's Rosary.
Callan-McHugh—Catechism of the Council of Trent; Moral Theology.
Cahill—Freemasonry.
Cambridge Summer School Lectures—The Atonement; Blessed Virgin; The Church; The Eucharist; The Incarnation; The New Testament; The Old Testament; The Religion of the Scriptures.
Camm—Forgotten Shrines.
Campbell—The Jesuits.
Canisius—Catechism.
Capel—The Faith of Catholics.
Capecelatro—St. Philip Neri.
Carrère—The Pope.
Carroll—God the Holy Ghost.
Casaca—The Pope and Italy.
Caussade—On Prayer; Progess in Prayer.
Cecilia—St. Matthew; St. Mark; St. Luke; St. John.
Chandlery—Mary's Praise on Every Tongue.
Chapman—Bishop Gore and the Catholic Claims; The First Eight Councils and Infallibility; History of the Vulgate Gospels; Matthew, Mark and Luke; Studies in the Early Papacy.
Charles—Prayer for All Times.
Chesterton—Autobiography; The Catholic Church and Conversion; Eugenics, The Everlasting Man.
Chetwood—God and Creation.
Chisholm—The Catechism in Examples.
Clarke—Handbook of the Divine Liturgy.
Clayton—Continuity; History of Anglicanism.
Cleary—The Church and Usury.

Clement—Thou Shalt Not Kill.
Coan—The Rule of Faith.
Coglan—The Parables.
Concannon—Queen of Ireland.
Connelly, Mother Cornelia.
Corly—Emancipation of a Freethinker.
Constant—The Reformation, Under Henry VIII; Under Edward VI.
Conway—The Question Box; Translations of the Question Box in Flemish, French, German, Portuguese, Slovak and Spanish; Studies in Church History; The Virgin Birth.
Corbishley—Roman Catholicism.
Coventry—The Breaking of Bread.
Snead Cox—Cardinal Vaughn.
Cronin—The Science of Ethics.
Curtis—Beyond the Road to Rome; Roads to Rome in America.
Cuthbert—God and the Supernatural.

D

Dalbiez—Psycho-Analytic Method.
Dalgairns—Holy Communion.
Dante—The Divine Comedy.
D'Arcy—The Incarnation; The Eucharistic Sacrifice; Jesus Christ, Priest and Redeemer; Life of the Church; Mass and Redemption; Mirage and Truth; Nature of Belief; Pain and the Providence of God.
Darton—His Mother.
Davis—Birth Control Ethics; Moral Theology.
Day—Christian Democracy.
Day—Our Friends the Jews.
Day—Union Square to Rome.
Delany—Rome from Within.
Delaye—What is Communism?
Delloué—Solution of the Great Problem.
Destrée—The Benedictions.
Devas—The Franciscans; Key to the World's Progress; Political Economy.
Devine—The Commandments; The Law of Christian Marriage; The Sacraments.
Devivier-Sasia—Apologetics.
Didon—Belief in the Divinity of Christ; The Life of Christ.
Doms—The Meaning of Marriage
Donovan—Catechism of the Council of Trent.
Dougherty—Outline of Bible Study.
Duchesne—Beginnings of the Temporal Power; Christian Worship; Churches Separated from Rome.

E

Elder—A Study in Socialism.
Eleanor—Mary.
Ellard—Christian Life and Worship; Mass of the Future.
Elliott—Life of Christ.

Ellis—Anti-Papal Legislation in Medieval England.
Emmanuel—Month of the Holy Ghost; The Holy Souls; St. Joseph; Mary; Sacred Heart.
Erasmus—Colloquies; Praise of Folly.
Eudes—Childhood of Mother of God, The Sacred Heart.
Eustace—Catholicism and Communism; Romewards.
Eymieu—Two Arguments for Catholicism.
Eyre—The Hidden Life of Christ.

F

Faber—The Blessed Sacrament.
Fages—Month of Roses.
Fallon—Eugenics.
Faulhaber—Judaism, Christianity and Germany; Women of the Bible.
Felder—Christ and the Critics.
Fenton—The Concept of Sacred Theology.
Fichter—Christianity.
Fillion—The Life of Christ; The Study of the Bible.
Finlay—The Church of Christ; Indifferentism.
Fitzsimons—Guide to Catholic Action.
Flynn—The Infused Virtues.
Fonck—The Parables.
Fortescue—Ceremonies of the Roman Rite; The Early Papacy; The Lesser Eastern Churches; The Orothodox Eastern Church; The Uniate Eastern Churches.
Fouard—The Life of Christ; St. Paul; St. Peter; St. Francis de Sales; Introduction to a Devout Life; The Love of God.
Frenay—The Suicide Problem in the United States.
Friedel—The Mariology of Cardinal Newman.
Friedman—The Cross and Star of David.
Fry—The Church Surprising.

G

Galtier—Sin and Penance.
Ganss—Mariolatry.
Gasparri—The Catholic Catechism.
Gasquet—The Last Abbot of Glastonbury; Anglican Ordinations; English Monastic Life; The Eve of the Reformation; Henry VIII and the English Monasteries; Cardinal Pole; Religio Religiosi; Sacramentals.
Gasquet-Bishop—Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer.
Gassner—The Canon of the Mass.
Gearon—Catholicism; Scruples; Spiritism.
Gerard—The Old Riddle and the Newest Answer.
Gerrard—The Church and Eugenics; The Cult of Mary.
Gibbons—Tramping to Lourdes.
Gibbons—The Ambassador of Christ; The Faith of Our Fathers; A Retrospect of Fifty-Years.
Gibergues—Divine Faith; The Mass and Christian Life.
Gigon—The Ethics of Peace and War.

Gigot—Biblical Lectures: Christ's Teaching on Divorce; General Introduction to the Bible; Special Introduction to the Bible.
Gihr—The Sacrifice of the Mass.
Gillet—Education of Character; Innocence and Ignorance.
Gillis—The Ten Commandments.
Gilson—God and Philosophy; Reason and Revelation.
Giordani—Mary of Nazareth; St. Paul.
Glenn—Apologetics; Ethics.
Goldstein—The Jewish Panorama; Socialism; What Say You?
Goodier—Inner Life of a Catholic; The Jesuits; Passion and Death of Christ; The Public Life of Christ; The Word Incarnate.
Graham—Where We Got The Bible.
Graham—The Christ of Catholicism.
Grandmaison—Life of Christ; Twenty Cures at Lourdes.
Grannan—General Introduction to the Bible.
Grant—So You Want to Get Married; What Other Answer?
Gregory—The Unfinished Universe.
Grisar—Luther.
Gruden—The Mystical Christ.
Guardini—The Church and the Catholic; Conscience.
Guchteneer—Judgment on Birth Control.
Guggenberger—History of the Christian Era.
Guiraud—The Medieval Inquisition.
Gwynn—The Struggle for Catholic Emancipation.

H

Haffert—Mary in Her Scapular Promise.
Haile—Cardinal Pole.
Harper—The Immaculate Conception.
Hartley—Women and the Catholic Church.
Harrington—Socialism, Capitalism, Communism.
Hawkins—Essentials of Theisn.
Healy—Ireland's Schools and Scholars.
Hecker—Aspirations of Nature; The Church and the Age; Questions of the Soul.
Hedley—Evolution and Faith; The Holy Eucharist; Our Christian Heritage; Wisdom from Above.
Henry—Catholic Customs and Symbols.
Hennrich—Boy Guidance; Watchful Elders; Youth Guidance.
Herwegen—St. Benedict.
Hettinger—Natural Religion; Revealed Religion.
Hildebrand—Liturgy and Personality; Marriage.
Hill—The Catholic's Ready Answer; Charity and the Three Vows.
Hilton—The Scale of Perfection.
Heinisch—The Theology of the Old Testament.
Heredia—Spiritism and Common Sense.
Hogan—The Mother of Divine Grace.
Holden—Early Years of Father Hecker.
Holland—Belief and Freedom.
Hollweck—Biographical Dictionary of the Saints.
Holsapple—Constantine the Great.
Howes—Slow Dawning.

Huby—Christ in the Gospel; Christus.
Huc—High Road to Tartary.
Hughes—The History of the Church; Pius XI.
Hugon—The Mystery of the Incarnation.
Hugueney—Catholicism and Criticism.
Hull—Medieval Theories of the Papacy; Theosophy.
D'Hulst—The Christian Family.
Hunter—Outlines of Dogmatic Theology.
Husslein—The Church and Social Problems; Social Wellsprings; The Spirit World About Us.
Huysmans—The Crowds at Lourdes.

I

St. Ignatius—The Spiritual Exercises.
Immaculata—Our Kateri.
Ingrim—After Hitler Stalin.
Into Their Company.
Iswolsky—The Soul of Russia; Soviet Men Now.

J

Jacquier—The Epistles of St. Paul.
Jane—The Blessed Virgin; The Life of Our Lord.
Janelle—The Counter Reformation.
Janin—Separated Eastern Churches.
Jarrett—St. Antonino, Patron of Economics; Meditations for Lay folks; The Religious Life, Social Theories of the Middle Ages; St. Dominic; The Dominicans; Medieval Socialism.
St. John of the Cross—Complete Works.
Johnson—Anthropology and the Fall.
Jordan—Catholicism in Education.
Jorgensen—Autobiography; Lourdes.
Joyce—Christian Marriage; Grace; The Question of Miracles; The Principle of Natural Theology.
Juergens—Newman on the Psychology of Faith.
Jugie—Purgatory.
Julleville—St. Joan of Arc.
Jurgenmeier—The Mystical Body of Christ.

K

Kane—The School of Love; The School of Mary; The School of Repentance.
Karrer—The Religions of Mankind.
Kearney—The Meaning of the Mass.
Keller—Mass Stipends.
Kellner—The Christian Festivals.
Kempis, à—The Imitation of Christ.
Kennedy—Studies in Tudor History.
Kennedy—God in His Infinite Perfections.
Keppler—The Souls in Purgatory.

Kerr—Catechism of Catholic Social Principles.
Kilker—Extreme Unction.
King—Holy Water.
King—The Rites of Eastern Christendom.
Kinsman—Americanism and Catholicism; Salve Mater; Trent.
Kirsch—The Communion of Saints; Sex Education.
Kissane—Isaiah; Job.
Klein—Jesus and His Apostles; The Trinity.
Kleist—Memoirs of St. Peter.
Knecht—A Bible Commentary.
Kneller—Christianity and the Leaders of Modern Science.
Koch—Handbook of Moral Theology.
Knox—God and the Atom; the New Testament; The Old Testament; The Psalms; Trials of a Translator.
Koesters—The Believers Christ.
Kurtscheid—The Seal of Confession.

L

Labauche—Baptism and Confirmation; God and Man.
LaFarge—The Jesuits in Modern Times; Interracial Justice; No Postponement.
Lagrange—Christ the Savior; God: Existence and Nature; The Gospel of Jesus Christ; Harmony of the Gospels; Historical Criticism of the Old Testament; The Meaning of Christianity; Providence; Predestination.
Lai—The Real Presence.
Lambert—Christian Science; Notes on Ingersoll.
Lambing—The Sacramentals.
Lamping—Through One Hundred Gates.
Lanciani—Pagan and Christian Rome.
Largent—St. Jerome.
Laros—Confirmation.
Lattey—Back to the Bible; Back to Christ; First Corinthians; St. Paul and His Teaching.
Lawrence—The Journey Home.
Lebbe—The Mass.
Lebec—Medical Proof of the Miraculous.
Lebreton—The History of the Primitive Church; The Life and Teaching of Christ.
Le Camus—The Life of Christ.
Leclercq—Marriage and the Family.
Leen—Our Blessed Lady; The Holy Ghost; What Is Education?
Leibel—Reading in Ethics.
Leo XIII—Great Encyclical Letters.
Leonard—The Authorship of Hebrews.
Lepecier—Indulgences; The Unseen World.
Levy—The Heavenly Road; Why Jews Become Catholics.
Lilly—The Canticle of Canticles.
Lindworsky—Training of the Will
Linjencrants—Spiritism and Religion.
Lingard—Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church; The History of England.
Livius—St. Peter, Bishop of Rome.

Lockhart—The Old Religion.
Lord—The Glorious Ten Commandments; Our Nuns.
Loenertz—The Apocalypse.
Lovat—St. Teresa.
Loyola—Hail, Full of Grace.
Lubac—Catholicism.
Lucas—Holy Mass; Savonorola.
Luddy—St. Bernard.
Lunn—Now I See; Science and the Supernatural; The Third Day.
Lynch—Acts of the Apostles; Joan or Arc.
Lyons—Christianity and Infallibility.

Mc

McCaffrey—The White Friars.
McCann—The Resurrection of the Body.
McCormick—The History of Education.
McCullagh—Bolshevik Persecution; In Franco's Spain; Red Mexico.
McDermott—Pius XII.
McDonald—It is the Mass That Matters; The Sacrifice of the Mass.
McFadden—The Philosophy of Communism.
McDonough—The Fall of Man.
McGarry—St. Paul and the Crucified.
McKenna—The Theology of Faith.
McKerlie—Shrines in Alsace and Lorraine.
McLaughlin—The Divine Plan of the Church.
McLean—The Morality of the Strike.
McNabb—The Christology of St. Paul; Infallibility; Life of Our Lord; St. Mary Magdalen; The New Testament Witness to St. Peter; Where Believers May Doubt.
McSorley—Outline History of the Church.

M

Maas—The Life of Christ; Christ in Type and Prophecy.
Macken—The Canonization of Saints.
Maginnis—The Scapular Devotion.
Maguire—Is Schism Lawful?
Maher—Psychology.
Mahon—The Church and Divorce.
Mahoney—Sin and Repentance.
Mainage—Immortality; Theosophy.
Mann—The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages.
Manning—The Eternal Priesthood; The Independence of the Holy See; The Interior Mission of the Holy Ghost; Sin and Its Consequences; The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost.
Mannix—The American Convert Movement.
Maranget—The Roman Mass.
Marchand—The Facts of Lourdes.
Marique—The History of Catholic Education.
Maritain—A Christian Looks at the Jewish Question; The Degrees of Knowledge; Freedom in the Modern World; Science and Wisdom.

Martindale—The Faith of the Roman Church; Anti-Christ; The History of Religions; Our Blessed Lady; The Sacramental System. Toward Loving the Psalms.

Matthew—The Church of Christ.

Maturin—The Parables; The Price of Unity; Self-Knowledge and Self-Discipline.

Mauriac—The Life of Christ.

Mausbach—Catholic Moral Teaching.

Maycock—The Inquisition.

Maynard—The Story of American Catholicism; Henry VIII.

Meistermann—A Guide to the Holy Land.

Mercier—A Manual of Scholastic Philosophy.

Mersch—The Whole Christ.

Meschler—The Life of Christ.

Messenger—Evolution and Theology; Two in One Flesh.

Messner—Christian Apologetics; Social Ethics.

Michel—Liturgy of the Church.

Miller—The Fall of Man.

Miller—General Psychology.

Milner—The End of Controversy.

Misciatelli—Savonarola.

Monahan—Madame Janet Stuart.

Moody—Fast By the Road; Long Road Home; Cardinal Newman.

Moon—Syllabus on International Relations; Imperialism and World Politics.

Moore—The Case Against Birth Control.

Moran—Introduction to Scripture.

Moran—The Government of the Church in the First Century.

Moran—The Persecution of Irish Catholics.

More—Dialogue Concerning Tyndale; Utopia.

Moreux—What Shall We Become After Death.

Morris—St. Patrick.

Morrison—Marriage; Revelation and the Modern Mind.

Mourret—The History of the Catholic Church.

Murphy—Cromwell in Ireland; Man's Unknown Ancestors.

N

Newman—The Arians of the Fourth Century; Development; Apologia; Difficulties of Anglicans; The Grammar of Assent; Historical Sketches; The Idea of a University; The Present Position of Catholicism in England.

Nesbitt—Our Lady in the Church.

Northcote—The Catacombs; The Curse of Adam; Development; God Made Man; Mary in the Gospels.

Norris—Church Vestments.

Noyes—The Unknown God; Voltaire.

O

O'Brien—The Faith of Millions; Religion in a Changing World; The Road to Damascus; Truths Men Live By; The White Harvest; Winning Converts.

O'Connell—The Church and the Bible.

O'Connor—Elizabethan Ireland.
O'Connor—The Layman's Call.
O'Doherty—Doctrinal Progress.
O'Grady—The Church and the Destitute; Introduction to Social Work; The Legal Minimum Wage.
O'Donnell—The Menace of Spiritism.
Ollivier—The Parables.
O'Malley—The Ethics of Medical Homicide.
O'Malley-Walsh—Essays on Pastoral Medicine.
O'Neill—Psalms and Canticles; The World's Classic, Job.
Orchard—The Cult of Our Lady; Faith to Faith; The Inevitable Cross; The Necessity of the Church.
Osgniach—The Christian State.
O'Shea—The Holy Family.

P

Papini—St. Augustine; The Life of Christ.
Parsons—Early Catholic Americana; The Pope and Italy.
Parsch—The Liturgy of the Mass; Study the Mass.
Paschang—The Sacramentals in the New Code.
Past Master—Freemasonry.
Pastor—The History of the Popes.
Paula—The Virgin Mother.
Paulus—Indulgences as a Social Factor.
Pegues—Catechism of the Summa.
Pernicone—The Ecclesiastical Prohibition of Books.
Peter of Alcantara, St.—Prayer and Meditation.
Petitalot—The Virgin Mother.
Petrovitz—Devotion to the Sacred Heart; The New Church Law on Matrimony.
Pickl—The Messias.
Pierik—The Song of the Church.
Plus—Baptism and Confirmation; The Eucharist; The Holiness of the Church; Mary in Our Soul Life.
Pohle—God the Author of Nature; God and His Knowability; Christology; Eschatology; The Holy Eucharist; Mariology; The Sacraments; Soteriology.
Pontifex—The Existence of God.
Pope—St. Augustine; The Church and the Bible; The Layman's New Testament; Student's Aid to the Bible.
Poulain—The Graces of Interior Prayer.
Poulet—The History of the Catholic Church.
Pourrat—Christian Spirituality; The Theology of the Sacraments.
Poussin—The Way to Nirvana.
Prat—Jesus Christ; The Theology of St. Paul.
Preuss—American Freemasonry.
Prior—Is the Pope Independent?
Psichari—A Soldier's Pilgrimage.

Q

Quigley—Condemned Societies; Decency in Motion Pictures; The Divine Office.
Quinn—Extreme Unction.

R

Raccolta, The.

Rager—Democracy and Bellarmine.

Raschab—Neo-Scholastic Philosophy.

Rauschen—Eucharist and Penance.

Ratton—Anti-Christ; The Apocalypse.

Raupert—Back to Rome; Christ and the Powers of Darkness; The Dangers of Spiritism; Modern Spiritism; The New Black Magic.

Reany—The Existence of the Human Soul.

Reatz—Jesus Christ.

Reeves—The Dominicans.

Reyes—God and His Attributes.

Ricciotti—The Life of Christ.

Rickaby—Development: Free Will and Four English Philosophers; In An Indian Abbey; The Lord My Light; Notes on St. Paul; Political and Moral Essays; The Problem of Evil.

Rivington—Authority; Dependence; Rome and England.

Rommen—The State and Catholic Thought.

Rooney—Preface to the Bible.

Rops, Daniel—Sacred History.

Ross—Christian Ethics.

Rudolf—Everyman's Theology.

Russell—The Bible and Character; Christ the Leader; Jesus the Divine Teacher.

Ruville—Back to Holy Church.

Ryan, James—A Catechism of Catholic Education.

Ryan, John—The Church and the Citizen; The Church and Labor; The Church and Socialism; Declining Liberty; Distributive Justice; The Living Wage.

Ryan-Miller—The State and the Church.

Ryan—Our Lady of Fatima.

Ryder—Catholic Controversy.

S

Salaville—Eastern Liturgies.

Salembier—The Great Schism of the West.

Sasia—The Future Life.

Saudreau—The Degrees of the Spiritual Life; The Life of Union with God; the Mystic State.

Schaefer—The Mother of Jesus.

Scheeben—The Glories of Divine Grace; Mariology.

Schenk—Cardinal Pole.

Schmidt—Origin and Growth of Religion.

Schmiedeler—Introductory Study of the Family; Marriage and the Family; The Sacred Bond.

Schneider—The Other Life.

Schwertner—The Rosary.

Schumacher—Handbook of Bible Study; Social Message of the New Testament.

Scott—Convent Life; Heaven; The Mass.

Scrulator—Back to Rome.

Searle—Christian Science; Plain Facts.

Semeria—The Eucharistic Liturgy.
Semple—Anglican Ordinations; Heaven Open to Souls.
Sencourt—Carmelite and Poet; Life of Newman; St. Paul.
Senderens—Creation and Evolution.
Sertillages—The Church; Faith; The Intellectual Life.
Shahan—The Beginnings of Christianity; The Middle Ages; St. Patrick in History.
Sharpe—Mysticisim; The Principles of Christianity.
Sheed—Communism and Man; The Nullity of Marriage; Theology and Sanity.
Sheehan—Apologetics.
Sheen—Communion and the Conscience of the West; God and Intelligence; The Mystical Body of Christ; The Philosophy of Science; Peace of Soul; Preface to Religion; Religion Without God.
Shields—The Dullard; The Philosophy of Education.
Sicard—The Mass.
Simon—General Introduction to the Bible.
Simon—The Story of My People.
Slater—Christ and Evolution; Moral Theology; Questions of Moral Theology.
Smet—Betrothment and Marriage.
Smith, George—Teachings of the Catholic Church.
Smith-Kaye—Three Ways Home.
Smyth—Genesis and Science.
Spirago—The Catechism Explained.
Stebbing—Outlines of the History of Philosophy; The Redemptorists.
Steinmüller—Catholic Biblical Encyclopedia; Companion to Bible Studies; Some Problems of the Old Testament.
Stewart—The Greater Eve.
Stoddard—A Troubled Heart.
Stoddard—Rebuilding of a Lost Faith.
Stott—St. Luke.
Stone—An Awakening.
Storf—The Immaculate Conception.
Stratman—The Church and War.
Sutcliffe—The Future Life in the Old Testament.

T

Taille, de la—Catholic Faith in the Eucharist; The Last Supper and Calvary; The Mystery of Faith.
Temple—The Boyhood Consciousness of Christ.
Temple—Pattern Divine: Our Lord's Hidden Life.
Teodorowicz—Mystical Phenomena in the Life of Teresa Neuman.
Teresa, St.—Autobiography; Complete Works; The Interior Castle; Letters; The Way of Perfection.
Therese, St.—Autobiography; Last Conversations.
Thomas, St.—Contra Gentiles; Prayer and the Contemplative Life; The Soul; The Summa.
Thurston—The Church and Confession; The Church and Spiritism; The Holy Year of Jubilee; Memory of Our Dead; No Popery; The Stations of the Cross.

Thompson—Verbal Concordance to the New Testament; Complete Concordance to the Bible.

Tixeront—The History of Dogmas; Holy Orders; Patrology.

U

Ullathorne—The Immaculate Conception.

Ullmann—Origin of the Western Schism.

Urban—Teacher's Handbook of Bible History; Teacher's Handbook of the Catechism.

V

Vacandard-Conway—The Inquisition.

Val, Merry del—Memories of Pius X; The Truth of the Papal Claims.

Valentin—The Trinity.

Vance—Reality and Truth.

Vandeur—Holy Mass.

Vassall-Phillips—Apostolic Christianity; Catholic Christianity The Mother of Christ; The Mother of God; The Mustard Tree.

Vaughan—The Divine Armory; Faith and Folly; St. Joan of Arc; Life After Death; Life Everlasting; The Purpose of the Papacy.

Veritas—The Mass and the Church of England.

Verres—Luther.

Vermeersch—The Sacred Heart; Tolerance.

Viator—From Geneva to Rome.

Villien—History of the Commandments of the Church.

Vincent—Judaism.

Von Hügel—Notes on the Petrine Claims; The Reality of God.

Vonier—Christ, King of Glory; Christian Mind; Christianus; The Divine Motherhood; Key to the Eucharist; Personality of Christ.

W

Walker—The Problem of Reunion; Why God Became Man.

Walsh—Apparitions and Shrines of the Blessed Virgin.

Walsh, James—The Popes and Science; Psychotherapy; Sex Instruction; The Thirteenth Century.

Walsh, William—Isabella of Spain.

Walsh—Catholic Apologetics; Christian Apologetics.

Ward—The Passionists.

Ward, Maisie—Catholic Evidence Outlines; Chesterton; The Wilfrid Wards and the Transition; Young Mr. Newman.

Wayne—Morals and Marriage.

Webb—Why Does God Permit Evil?

Willam—The Life of Christ; Mary, Mother of God.

Williams—The High Romance; The Shadow of the Pope.

Williamson—The Book of Life; The Vatican Treaty.

Willman—Married Life; The Science of Education.

Wilson—Pardon and Peace.

Windle—The Catholic Church and Science; Miracles and Other Essays; Religions Past and Present; Science and Morals.
Winslow—The Pauline Privilege.
Wiseman—Lectures on the Holy Eucharist.
Woodlock—The Catholic Pattern.
Woods—St. Augustine and Evolution.

Z

Zolle—The Nazarene.
Zundel—Our Lady of Wisdom; Splendor of the Liturgy.

New York
The Paulist Press
401 West 59th Street
51

THIS BOOK MAY BE KEPT
FOURTEEN DAYS
A FINE WILL BE CHARGED FOR EACH
DAY THE BOOK IS KEPT OVERTIME.

SEP 17 1981
NOV 12 1981
SEP 23 1982
OCT 22 1982
APR 22 1985
MAY 7 '90
SEP 17 '90
NOV 27 '96
SEP 26 '98
01/03/2000
AUG 02 '04
AUG 01 '05
DEC 15 2015

DEMCO 38-293

CINCINNATI BIBLE COLLEGE & SEM. LIBRARY
282 C769 main
Conway, Bertrand L./The question box : r
3 4320 00077 6460

282
C769 5955

Conway, Bertrand L.

The Question Box

THE CINCINNATI BIBLE
SEMINARY LIBRARY
A. No. 5955
D. D. No. 282
C769